arXiv:1103.2525v3 [math.RT] 21 Apr 2011

ON A CLASSIFICATION OF IRREDUCIBLE ADMISSIBLE MODULO p REPRESENTATIONS OF A p-ADIC SPLIT REDUCTIVE GROUP

NORIYUKI ABE

Abstract. We give a classification of irreducible admissible modulo p representations of a split p-adic reductive group in terms of supersingular representations. This is a generalization of a theorem of Herzig.

1. Introduction

Let p be a prime number and F a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$. In this paper, we consider modulo p representations of (the group of F-valued points of) a split connected reductive group G. The study of such representations is started by Barthel-Livné [BL94, BL95] when $G = \mathrm{GL}_2(F)$. They defined a notion of *supersingular representations* and gave a classification of non-supersingular irreducible representations. In particular, they proved that a representation is supersingular if and only if it is supercuspidal. Here, a representation is called *supercuspidal* if and only if it dose not appear as a subquotient of a parabolic induction from a proper parabolic subgroup. By this theorem, to classify irreducible representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(F)$, it is sufficient to classify irreducible supersingular representations. When $G = \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, irreducible supersingular representations are classified by Breuil [Bre03]. However, when $F \neq \mathbb{Q}_p$ a classification seems more complicated [BP].

Herzig [Her10] gave a definition of a supersingular representation for any G using the modulo p Satake transform [Her11]. He also gave a classification of irreducible admissible representations in terms of supersingular representations when $G = \mathrm{GL}_n(F)$. This is a generalization of a theorem of Barthel-Livné. In this paper, we generalize his classification to any G.

Now we state our main theorem. Let $\overline{\kappa}$ be an algebraic closure of the residue field of F. All representations in this paper are smooth representations over $\overline{\kappa}$. Fix an $\mathcal{O}$-form of G and denote it by the same letter G. Let K be the group of $\mathcal{O}$-valued points of G. We also fix a Borel subgroup B and a maximal torus $T \subset B$ of G. Then we can define the notion of supersingular representation with respect to (K, T, B). (See Herzig's paper [Her10, Definition 4.7] or Definition 5.1 in this paper.) Let Π be the set of simple roots. Each subset $\Theta \subset \Pi$ corresponds to the standard parabolic subgroup P_Θ. Let $P_\Theta = M_\Theta N_\Theta$ be the Levi decomposition such that $T \subset M_\Theta$ and N_Θ is the unipotent radical of P_Θ. Consider the set $\mathcal{P}$ of all $\Lambda = (\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \sigma_1)$ such that:

- Π_1 and Π_2 are subsets of Π.
- σ_1 is an irreducible admissible representation of M_{Π_1} which is supersingular with respect to $(M_{\Pi_1} \cap K, T, M_{\Pi_1} \cap B)$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 22E50.

- Let ω_{σ_1} be the central character of σ_1 and put $\Pi_{\sigma_1} = \{\alpha \in \Pi \mid \langle \alpha, \check{\Pi}_1\rangle = 0,\ \omega_{\sigma_1} \circ \check{\alpha} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{GL}_1(F)}\}$. Then $\Pi_2 \subset \Pi_{\sigma_1}$.

Then the main theorem says that there exists a bijection between $\mathcal{P}$ and the set of isomorphism classes of irreducible admissible representations of G.

To state the theorem more precisely, we define the representation $I(\Lambda)$ for $\Lambda = (\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \sigma_1) \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $P_\Lambda = M_\Lambda N_\Lambda$ be the Levi decomposition of the standard parabolic subgroup corresponding to $\Pi_1 \cup \Pi_{\sigma_1}$. First we construct the representation σ_Λ of M_Λ. Roughly, σ_Λ is given by the following. Since $\langle \Pi_1, \check{\Pi}_{\sigma_1}\rangle = 0$, M_Λ is like the direct product of M_{Π_1} and $M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}$. We have a representation σ_1 of M_{Π_1}. Since $\Pi_2 \subset \Pi_{\sigma_1}$, Π_2 defines the standard parabolic subgroup of $M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}$ and it also defines the special representation [GK]. Let $\sigma_{\Lambda,2}$ be the special representation. Then σ_Λ is given by the tensor product $\sigma_1 \boxtimes \sigma_{\Lambda,2}$. However we have $M_\Lambda \not\simeq M_{\Pi_1} \times M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}$. We define σ_Λ as follows.

We can prove that σ_1 can be extended uniquely to M_Λ such that $[M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}, M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}]$ acts on it trivially (Lemma 3.2). We denote the extended representation by the same letter σ_1. Let Q be the parabolic subgroup of M_Λ corresponding to $\Pi_2 \cup \Pi_{\sigma_1}$. Then Q defines the special representation of M_Λ [GK] and denote it by $\sigma_{\Lambda,2}$. From the definition of the special representation, the restriction of $\sigma_{\Lambda,2}$ to $M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}$ is the special representation of $M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}$ with respect to the standard parabolic subgroup corresponding to Π_2. Now we define $\sigma_\Lambda = \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_{\Lambda,2}$ and put $I(\Lambda) = \mathrm{Ind}_{P_\Lambda}^G(\sigma_\Lambda)$. The following is the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 5.10)**.** *For $\Lambda \in \mathcal{P}$, $I(\Lambda)$ is irreducible and the correspondence $\Lambda \mapsto I(\Lambda)$ gives a bijection between $\mathcal{P}$ and the set of isomorphism classes of irreducible admissible representations.*

Using this theorem, we get the relation between supersingular representations and supercuspidal representations. Recall that a representation is called *supersingular* if it is supersingular with respect to any (K, T, B).

Theorem 1.2 (Corollary 5.12)**.** *For an irreducible admissible representation π of G, the following conditions are equivalent.*

1. *The representation π is supersingular with respect to (K, T, B).*
2. *The representation π is supersingular.*
3. *The representation π is supercuspidal.*

We also give a criterion of the irreducibility of a principal series representation.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\nu\colon T \to \overline{\kappa}^\times$ be a character. Then $\mathrm{Ind}_B^G \nu$ is irreducible if and only if $\nu \circ \check{\alpha} \ne \mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{GL}_1(F)}$ for all $\alpha \in \Pi$.*

Herzig proved much of his results for general G. However, he proved the following two propositions only under some assumptions. (Such assumptions are satisfied for $G = \mathrm{GL}_n$.)

1. A theorem of changing the weight [Her10, Corollary 6.10].
2. A structure of a representation which have the "trivial" Satake parameter [Her10, Proposition 9.1].

In this paper, we prove these propositions for any G. Then, Herzig's argument implies the main theorem.

We summarize the contents of this paper. Using the modulo p Satake transform, the notion of Satake parameters (or Hecke eigenvalues) is defined. Such definition and properties are given in Section 3. A generalization of (1) and (2) is proved in Section 4. In Section 4, we assume that the derived group of G is simply connected. Using these results, we prove our main theorem in Section 5. Since we use results in Section 4, first we assume that the derived group of G is simply connected. This assumption will be removed in subsection 5.4 using a z-extension.

Acknowledgments. I thank Florian Herzig for reading the manuscript and giving helpful comments. I also thank Tetsushi Ito for introducing me the theory of modulo p representations of a p-adic group.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Notation.** In this paper, we use the following notation. Let p be a prime number, F a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$, $\mathcal{O}$ its ring of integers, $\varpi \in \mathcal{O}$ a uniformizer, $\kappa = \mathcal{O}/(\varpi)$ the residue field and $q = \#\kappa$. Let G be a connected split reductive group over $\mathcal{O}$. Fix a Borel subgroup $B \subset G$ and a split maximal torus $T \subset B$. Let U be the unipotent radical of B. Then $B = TU$ is a Levi decomposition of B. Let $\overline{B} = T\overline{U}$ be a Levi decomposition of the opposite group of B. We also denote the group of F-valued points of G by the same character G. This should cause no confusion. We use similar notation for other groups (for example, $B = B(F)$). Set $K = G(\mathcal{O})$. For any algebraic group H, let H° be the connected component containing the unit element and Z_H the center of H. For subgroups $H_1, H_2 \subset H$, $Z_{H_1}(H_2) = \{h_1 \in H_1 \mid h_1h_2 = h_2h_1 \text{ for all } h_2 \in H_2\}$. For a group Γ, $\mathbf{1}_\Gamma$ is the trivial representation of Γ. For a representation V of Γ, V^Γ is the space of invariants and V_Γ is the space of coinvariants.

Let $(X^*, \Delta, X_*, \check{\Delta})$ be the root system of (G, T). Then B determines the set of positive roots $\Delta^+ \subset \Delta$ and the set of simple roots $\Pi \subset \Delta^+$. Let W be its Weyl group. Let $\mathrm{red}\colon K = G(\mathcal{O}) \to G(\kappa)$ be the canonical morphism. The set of dominant (resp. anti-dominant) elements in X^* is denoted by X^*_+ (resp. X^*_-). We also use notation $X_{*,+}$ and $X_{*,-}$. For $\lambda, \mu \in X_*$, we denote $\mu \le \lambda$ if $\lambda - \mu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}\check{\Pi}$.

Let P be a standard parabolic subgroup. It has a Levi decomposition $P = MN$. In this paper, we only consider the decomposition such that $T \subset M$. The opposite parabolic subgroup of P is denoted by $\overline{P} = M\overline{N}$. We denote the Levi decomposition of the standard parabolic subgroup corresponding to $\Theta \subset \Pi$ by $P_\Theta = M_\Theta N_\Theta$. The subset of Π corresponding to P is denoted by Π_P or Π_M. Put $\Delta_M = \Delta \cap \mathbb{Z}\Pi_M$ and $\Delta_M^+ = \Delta^+ \cap \Delta_M$. Let W_M be the Weyl group of Δ_M. For $\nu \in X^*$, let $P_\nu = M_\nu N_\nu$ be the standard parabolic subgroup corresponding to $\Pi_\nu = \{\alpha \in \Pi \mid \langle \nu, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0\}$. Put $W_\nu = \mathrm{Stab}_W(\nu)$, $\Delta_\nu = \{\alpha \in \Delta \mid \langle \nu, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0\}$ and $\Delta_\nu^+ = \Delta^+ \cap \Delta_\nu$. (We will use these notation only when ν is dominant or anti-dominant. So the root system of M_ν is Δ_ν.) We use similar notation for $\lambda \in X_*$.

For a subset $A \subset X^*$ and $A' \subset X_*$, $\langle A, A' \rangle = 0$ means $\langle \nu, \lambda \rangle = 0$ for all $\nu \in A$ and $\lambda \in A'$. Notice that this condition is automatically satisfied if A or A' is empty. We write $\langle A, \lambda \rangle = 0$ (resp. $\langle \nu, A' \rangle = 0$) instead of $\langle A, \{\lambda\} \rangle = 0$ (resp. $\langle \{\nu\}, A' \rangle = 0$).

2.2. **Satake transform and irreducible representations of K.** Let $\overline{\kappa}$ be an algebraic closure of κ. *All representations in this paper are smooth representations over $\overline{\kappa}$.* For a finite dimensional representation V of K, let $\text{c-Ind}_K^G V$ be a representation defined by

$$\text{c-Ind}_K^G V = \{f\colon G \to V \mid f(xk) = k^{-1}f(x)\ (x \in G, k \in K),\ \operatorname{supp} f \text{ is compact}\}.$$

The action of $g \in G$ is given by $(gf)(x) = f(g^{-1}x)$. For $x \in G$ and $v \in V$, let $[x, v] \in \text{c-Ind}_K^G(V)$ be an element defined by $\operatorname{supp}([x, v]) = xK$ and $[x, v](x) = v$. Then $g[x, v] = [gx, v]$ and $[xk, v] = [x, kv]$ for $g \in G$ and $k \in K$. For finite dimensional representations V_1, V_2 of K, $\operatorname{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G V_1, \text{c-Ind}_K^G V_2)$ is identified with

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{H}_G(V_1, V_2)\\ &\quad= \left\{ \varphi\colon G \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\overline{\kappa}}(V_1, V_2) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} \varphi(k_2 x k_1) = k_2 \varphi(x) k_1 \ (k_1, k_2 \in K, x \in G), \\ \operatorname{supp} \varphi \text{ is compact} \end{array} \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

The operator corresponding to $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_G(V_1, V_2)$ is given by $f \mapsto \varphi * f$ where

$$(\varphi * f)(x) = \sum_{y \in G/K} \varphi(y) f(xy).$$

We denote $\mathcal{H}_G(V, V)$ by $\mathcal{H}_G(V)$. Let π be a representation of G. Then by the Frobenius reciprocity law, we have $\operatorname{Hom}_K(V, \pi) \simeq \operatorname{Hom}_G(\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V), \pi)$. Hence $\operatorname{Hom}_K(V, \pi)$ is a right $\mathcal{H}_G(V)$-module. We denote the action of $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_G(V)$ on $\psi \in \operatorname{Hom}_K(V, \pi)$ by $\psi * \varphi$.

When V is irreducible, the structure of $\mathcal{H}_G(V)$ is given by the *Satake transform* [Her11]. Namely, the Satake transform $S_G\colon \mathcal{H}_G(V) \to \mathcal{H}_T(V^{\overline{U}(\kappa)})$ defined by

$$S_G(\varphi)(t) = \sum_{u \in \overline{U}/\overline{U}(\mathcal{O})} \varphi(tu)|_{V^{\overline{U}(\kappa)}}$$

is injective and its image is $\{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_T(V^{\overline{U}(\kappa)}) \mid \operatorname{supp} \varphi \subset T_+\}$ where $T_+ = \{t \in T \mid \alpha(t) \in \mathcal{O}\ (\alpha \in \Delta^+)\}$. A homomorphism $X_* \times T(\mathcal{O}) \to T$ defined by $(\lambda, t_0) \mapsto \lambda(\varpi) t_0$ is an isomorphism and it induces $X_{*,+} \times T(\mathcal{O}) \simeq T_+$. Hence S_G gives an isomorphism $\mathcal{H}_G(V) \simeq \overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}]$. For $\lambda \in X_{*,+}$, there exists $T_\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_G(V)$ such that $\operatorname{supp} T_\lambda = K\lambda(\varpi)K$ and $T_\lambda(\lambda(\varpi))$ is given by $V \twoheadrightarrow V_{\overline{N_\lambda}(\kappa)} \simeq V^{N_\lambda(\kappa)} \hookrightarrow V$. Then $\{T_\lambda \mid \lambda \in X_{*,+}\}$ gives a basis of $\mathcal{H}_G(V)$. When we want to emphasis the group G, we write T_λ^G instead of T_λ. For $\lambda \in X_*$, let $\tau_\lambda \in \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ be an element corresponding to λ. Then $\{\tau_\lambda \mid \lambda \in X_{*,+}\}$ gives a basis of $\overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}]$. The relation between $S_G(T_\lambda)$ and τ_λ is given by Herzig [Her10, Proposition 5.1]. An algebra homomorphism $\overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}] \to \overline{\kappa}$ is parameterized by (M, χ_M) where M is the Levi subgroup of a standard parabolic subgroup and χ_M is a group homomorphism $X_{M,*,0} \to \overline{\kappa}^\times$ where $X_{M,*,0} = \{\lambda \in X_* \mid \langle \lambda, \Pi_M \rangle = 0\}$ [Her10, Proposition 4.1]. Therefore, an algebra homomorphism $\mathcal{H}_G(V) \to \overline{\kappa}$ is parameterized by the same pair.

Remark 2.1. Since an isomorphism $\mathcal{H}_T(V^{\overline{U}(\kappa)}) \simeq \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ depends on a choice of a uniformizer ϖ, the above parameterization is not natural. More natural way is given by Herzig [Her11]. In this paper, we fix a uniformizer and identify $\mathcal{H}_G(V)$ with $\overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}]$. (It is only for a simplification of notation.)

Let $P = MN$ be the Levi decomposition of a standard parabolic subgroup. Then the partial Satake transform $S_G^M\colon \mathcal{H}_G(V) \to \mathcal{H}_M(V^{\overline{N}(\kappa)})$ is injective and it satisfies $S_M \circ S_G^M = S_G$ [Her10, 2.3]. Assume that $\chi\colon \mathcal{H}_G(V) \to \overline{\kappa}$ is parameterized by (M, χ_M). Then M is characterized by the following property: χ factors through $S_G^{M'}$ if and only if $M' \supset M$. We also have the following: $\chi_M(\lambda) = \chi(\tau_\lambda)$.

Let V_1, V_2 be irreducible representations of K. For each $\lambda \in X_{*,+}$, there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(V_1, V_2) \setminus \{0\}$ whose support is $K\lambda(\varpi)K$ if and only if $V_1^{\overline{N_\lambda}(\kappa)} \simeq V_2^{\overline{N_\lambda}(\kappa)}$ as $M_\lambda(\kappa)$-representations. Moreover such φ is unique up to constant multiple. The homomorphism $\varphi(\lambda(\varpi))$ is given by $V_1 \twoheadrightarrow (V_1)_{N_\lambda(\kappa)} \simeq V_2^{\overline{N_\lambda}(\kappa)} \hookrightarrow V_2$. (See the proof of [Her10, Proposition 6.3].)

All irreducible representations of K factor through $K \to G(\kappa)$. If the derived group of G is simply connected, such representation is parameterized by its lowest weight. If $\nu \in X^*$ satisfies $-q < \langle \nu, \check{\alpha} \rangle \leq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Pi$ then the restriction of the irreducible representation of $G(\overline{\kappa})$ with lowest weight ν to $G(\kappa)$ is irreducible and they give all irreducible representations of $G(\kappa)$. When V is the restriction of an irreducible representation with lowest weight ν, we call ν a lowest weight of V. (For $\nu_0 \in X^*$ such that $\langle \nu_0, \check{\Pi} \rangle = 0$, the restriction of the irreducible representations with lowest weight ν and $\nu + (q-1)\nu_0$ are isomorphic to each other. Hence ν is not determined by V uniquely.)

3. Satake parameters

3.1. **Definition and some lemmas.** We start with the following definition.

Definition 3.1. Let π be a representation of G. An algebra homomorphism $\chi\colon \overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}] \to \overline{\kappa}$ is called a *Satake parameter of* π if there exist an irreducible K-representation V and $\psi \in \operatorname{Hom}_K(V, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$ such that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_G(V)$, $\psi * \varphi = \chi(S_G(\varphi))\psi$.

Let $\mathcal{S}(\pi, V)$ be the set of Satake parameters appearing in $\operatorname{Hom}_K(V, \pi)$. We denote the set of Satake parameters of π by $\mathcal{S}(\pi)$. Then we have $\mathcal{S}(\pi) = \bigcup_V \mathcal{S}(\pi, V)$. If π is admissible, then $\mathcal{S}(\pi) \neq \emptyset$. We give some propositions about Satake parameters. Before proving some properties of Satake parameters, we give some fundamental facts about a structure of G.

Lemma 3.2. *Let* $\Pi = \Pi_1 \cup \Pi_2$ *be a partition of* Π *such that* $\langle \Pi_1, \check{\Pi}_2 \rangle = 0$ *and* $P_i = M_i N_i$ *the standard parabolic subgroup corresponding to* Π_i. *Let* L_2 *be the subgroup of* $T \subset M_1$ *generated by* $\{\operatorname{Im} \check{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \Pi_2\}$. *Then we have* $G/[M_2, M_2] \simeq M_1/L_2$.

Proof. Let $\overline{F}$ be a separable closure of F. In this proof, we write $\mathbf{G} = G(\overline{F})$. (The same notation is used for other groups.) Set $\check{\Pi}_2^{\perp} = \{\nu \in X^* \mid \langle \nu, \check{\Pi}_2 \rangle = 0\}$. Since $\mathbf{G}/[\mathbf{M}_2, \mathbf{M}_2]$ and $\mathbf{M}_1/\mathbf{L}_2$ have the same root data $(\check{\Pi}_2^{\perp}, \Delta_{M_1}, X_*/(\mathbb{Q}\check{\Pi}_2 \cap X_*), \check{\Delta}_{M_1})$, these are isomorphic. For an abelian group A, let A_{tors} be its torsion part. By a theorem of Kottwitz, the Galois cohomology $H^1(F, [\mathbf{M}_2, \mathbf{M}_2])$ (resp. $H^1(F, \mathbf{G})$) is isomorphic to $((X_* \cap \mathbb{Q}\check{\Pi}_2)/\mathbb{Z}\check{\Pi}_2)_{\mathrm{tors}}$ (resp. $(X_*/\mathbb{Z}\check{\Pi})_{\mathrm{tors}}$). Hence $H^1(F, [\mathbf{M}_2, \mathbf{M}_2]) \to H^1(F, \mathbf{G})$ is injective. Therefore, $(\mathbf{G}/[\mathbf{M}_2, \mathbf{M}_2])^{\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{F}/F)} = G/[M_2, M_2]$. Since $\mathbf{L}_2$ is a torus, $H^1(F, \mathbf{L}_2)$ is trivial. Hence $(\mathbf{M}_1/\mathbf{L}_2)^{\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{F}/F)} = M_1/L_2$. The lemma follows. $\square$

Proposition 3.3. *There is a one-to-one correspondence between the character* ν_G *of* G *and the character* ν_T *of* T *such that* $\nu_T \circ \check{\alpha}$ *is trivial for all* $\alpha \in \Pi$. *It is characterized by* $\nu_T = \nu_G|_T$.

Proof. Apply the previous lemma for $\Pi_1 = \emptyset$ and $\Pi_2 = \Pi$. $\square$

Corollary 3.4. *Let* ν_K *be a character of* K. *Then there exists a character* ν_G *of* G *such that* $\nu_K = \nu_G|_K$. *If* $\nu_G(\lambda(\varpi)) = 1$ *for all* $\lambda \in X_*$, *then* ν_G *is unique.*

Proof. If the derived group of G is simply connected, it is known that ν_K has a lowest weight ν which satisfies $(\nu\circ\check{\alpha})(\mathcal{O}^\times)=1$ for all $\alpha\in\Pi$. Therefore, the corollary follows from the above proposition. In general, let $1\to Z\to\widetilde{G}\to G\to 1$ be a z-extension of G, $\widetilde{K}$ the group of $\mathcal{O}$-valued points of $\widetilde{G}$ and $\widetilde{T}$ the inverse image of T in $\widetilde{G}$. Then there exists a character $\nu_{\widetilde{G}}$ such that $\nu_{\widetilde{G}}|_{\widetilde{K}}$ is a pull-back of ν_K and $\nu_{\widetilde{G}}(\lambda(\varpi))=1$ for all $\lambda\in X_*(\widetilde{T})$. Hence $\nu_{\widetilde{G}}|_Z$ is trivial. Therefore, it gives a character ν_G of G and $\nu_G|_K=\nu_K$. □

For a character ν of G, $\varphi\mapsto(g\mapsto\varphi_\nu(g)=\varphi(g)\nu(g))$ gives an isomorphism $\mathcal{H}_G(V)\simeq\mathcal{H}_G(V\otimes\nu|_K)$.

Lemma 3.5. *For a parabolic subgroup $P=MN$, the homomorphism $\varphi\mapsto\varphi_\nu$ is compatible with the partial Satake transform S_G^M.*

Proof. We have

$$(S_G^M\varphi_\nu)(m)=\sum_{n\in N/(N\cap K)}\nu(mn)\varphi(mn).$$

Since $N\subset[G,G]$, we have $\nu(n)=1$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{n\in N/(N\cap K)}\nu(mn)\varphi(mn)=\nu(m)\sum_{n\in N/(N\cap K)}\varphi(mn)=\nu(m)(S_G^M\varphi)(m).$$

□

Now we give some properties on Satake parameters. The following proposition is obvious.

Proposition 3.6. *If $\pi'\subset\pi$, then $\mathcal{S}(\pi',V)\subset\mathcal{S}(\pi,V)$.*

The following proposition follows from [Her10, Lemma 2.14].

Proposition 3.7. *Let $P=MN$ be a parabolic subgroup, σ a representation of M and V an irreducible representation of K. Then we have $\mathcal{S}(\mathrm{Ind}_P^G(\sigma),V)=\mathcal{S}(\sigma,V^{\overline{N}(\kappa)})|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}]}$. In particular, we have $\mathcal{S}(\mathrm{Ind}_P^G(\sigma))=\mathcal{S}(\sigma)|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}]}$.*

Let $\chi_1,\chi_2\colon\overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}]\to\overline{\kappa}$ be algebra homomorphisms. Define $\chi_1\otimes\chi_2\colon\overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}]\to\overline{\kappa}$ by $(\chi_1\otimes\chi_2)(\tau_\lambda)=\chi_1(\tau_\lambda)\chi_2(\tau_\lambda)$.

Proposition 3.8. *Assume χ_i is parameterized by (M_i,χ_{M_i}). Then $\chi_1\otimes\chi_2$ is parameterized by (M,χ_M) where $\Pi_M=\Pi_{M_1}\cap\Pi_{M_2}$ and $\chi_M=\chi_{M_1}|_{X_{M,*,0}}\chi_{M_2}|_{X_{M,*,0}}$.*

Proof. This follows from the argument of the proof of [Her11, Corollary 1.5]. □

Proposition 3.9. *Let ν be a character of G and π a representation of G. Then $\mathcal{S}(\pi\otimes\nu)=\mathcal{S}(\pi)\otimes\chi_\nu$ here $\chi_\nu\colon\overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}]\to\overline{\kappa}$ is given by $\chi_\nu(\tau_\lambda)=\nu(\lambda(\varpi))$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 3.5. □

Proposition 3.10. *Let ν be a character of G. Then $\mathcal{S}(\nu)=\{\chi_\nu\}$.*

Proof. We have an injective homomorphism $\nu\hookrightarrow\mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\nu|_T)$. Hence we have $\emptyset\neq\mathcal{S}(\nu)\subset\mathcal{S}(\mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\nu|_T))=\mathcal{S}(\nu|_T)|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}]}=\{\chi_\nu\}$. □

3.2. **Restriction and Satake parameter.** Let G_1 be a connected subgroup of G which contains $[G,G]$. Let $X_{G_1,*}$ be the group of cocharacters of $G_1 \cap T$. Put $X_{G_1,*,+} = X_{*,+} \cap X_{G_1,*}$. Then we have $\mathcal{H}_{G_1}(V) \simeq \overline{\kappa}[X_{G_1,*,+}]$. Since $X_{G_1,*,+} \subset X_{*,+}$, we have an injective homomorphism $\overline{\kappa}[X_{G_1,*,+}] \hookrightarrow \overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}]$. This induces $\Phi\colon \mathcal{H}_{G_1}(V) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_G(V)$.

Lemma 3.11. *We have* $\operatorname{Im}\Phi = \{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_G(V) \mid \operatorname{supp}\varphi \subset G_1K\}$ *and an isomorphism* $\operatorname{Im}\Phi \simeq \mathcal{H}_{G_1}(V)$ *is given by* $\varphi \mapsto \varphi|_{G_1}$.

Proof. Put $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_G(V) \mid \operatorname{supp}\varphi \subset G_1K\}$. Then $\mathcal{H}_1$ has a basis $\{T_\lambda^G \mid \lambda \in X_{G_1,*,+}\}$. To prove the first statement of the lemma, it is sufficient to prove that if $\lambda \in X_{G_1,*,+}$ then $S_G(T_\lambda^G) \in \overline{\kappa}[X_{G_1,*,+}]$ and $\{S_G(T_\lambda^G) \mid \lambda \in X_{G_1,*,+}\}$ is a basis of $\overline{\kappa}[X_{G_1,*,+}]$. We have $S_G(T_\lambda^G) \in \tau_\lambda + \sum_{\mu\le\lambda}\overline{\kappa}\tau_\mu$. Since $\check{\Pi} \subset X_{G_1,*}$, $\lambda \in X_{G_1,*}$ and $\mu \le \lambda$ imply $\mu \in X_{G_1,*}$. Therefore we get the first statement.

Since U is the unipotent radical of the Borel subgroup $B \cap G_1$ of G_1, we have $S_G(T_\lambda^G) = S_{G_1}(T_\lambda^G|_{G_1})$ for $\lambda \in X_{G_1,*,+}$ by the definition of the Satake transform. We get the second statement. $\square$

Proposition 3.12. *Let π be a representation of G and V an irreducible representation of K. Then we have* $\mathcal{S}(\pi,V)|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{G_1,*,+}]} \subset \mathcal{S}(\pi|_{G_1}, V|_{G_1\cap K})$. *Hence* $\mathcal{S}(\pi)|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{G_1,*,+}]} \subset \mathcal{S}(\pi|_{G_1})$.

Moreover, if π has a central character, then for each irreducible $(G_1 \cap K)$-representation V_1, we have $\mathcal{S}(\pi|_{G_1}, V_1) = \bigcup_{V|_{G_1\cap K}=V_1} \mathcal{S}(\pi,V)|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{G_1,*,+}]}$. *Hence* $\mathcal{S}(\pi|_{G_1}) = \mathcal{S}(\pi)|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{G_1,*,+}]}$.

Proof. Put $K_1 = G_1 \cap K$. Since $[K,K] \subset K_1$, the restriction of an irreducible K-representation to K_1 is also irreducible. Let V be an irreducible representation of K. We prove $\mathcal{S}(\pi,V)|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{G_1,*,+}]} \subset \mathcal{S}(\pi|_{G_1}, V|_{K_1})$. It is sufficient to prove that

$$\operatorname{Hom}_K(V,\pi) \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Hom}_{K_1}(V,\pi)$$

is $\mathcal{H}_{G_1}(V)$-module homomorphism. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_{G_1}(V)$ and $\psi \in \operatorname{Hom}_K(V,\pi)$. Then for each $v \in V$,

$$(\psi * \Phi(\varphi))(v) = \sum_{g\in G/K} g\psi(\Phi(\varphi)(g^{-1})v) = \sum_{g\in G_1K/K} g\psi(\Phi(\varphi)(g^{-1})v).$$

The claim follows from $G_1/K_1 \simeq G_1K/K$.

Assume that π has a central character. Let V_1 be an irreducible representation of K_1. Fix an irreducible representation V of K such that $V|_{K_1} = V_1$. Take such representation such that a central character of V is the same as that of π. Set $K' = K_1Z_K$. Then K' has a finite index in K and we have

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{K_1}(V,\pi) = \operatorname{Hom}_{K'}(V,\pi) \simeq \operatorname{Hom}_K(\operatorname{Ind}_{K'}^K(V),\pi).$$

Since V has a structure of a representation of K, we have $\operatorname{Ind}_{K'}^K(V) \simeq \operatorname{Ind}_{K'}^K(\mathbf{1}_{K'}) \otimes V$. Therefore we have

$$\Psi\colon \operatorname{Hom}_{K_1}(V,\pi) \simeq \operatorname{Hom}_K(\operatorname{Ind}_{K'}^K(\mathbf{1}_{K'}) \otimes V,\pi).$$

Explicitly, this isomorphism is given by

$$\Psi(\psi)(f\otimes v) = \sum_{x\in K/K'} f(x)x\psi(x^{-1}(v)).$$

Therefore, for $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_{G_1}(V)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(\psi * \varphi)(f \otimes v) = \sum_{x \in K/K'} f(x)x \sum_{g \in G_1/K_1} g\psi(\varphi(g^{-1})x^{-1}v)\\ = \sum_{x \in K/K'} \sum_{g \in G_1/K_1} f(x)(xg)\psi(\varphi((xg)^{-1})v).\end{aligned}$$

Replacing g with $x^{-1}gx$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(\psi * \varphi)(f \otimes v) = \sum_{x \in K/K'} \sum_{g \in G_1/K_1} f(x)gx\psi(x^{-1}\varphi(g^{-1})v)\\ = \sum_{g \in G_1/K_1} g\Psi(\psi)(f \otimes \varphi(g^{-1})v).\end{aligned}$$

Since K' is a normal subgroup of K and K/K' is commutative, the representation $\operatorname{Ind}_{K'}^{K}(\mathbf{1}_{K'})$ has a filtration $\{X_i\}$ such that $X_i/X_{i-1} \simeq \nu_i$ for some character ν_i of K. Set $X = \operatorname{Ind}_{K'}^{K}(\mathbf{1}_{K'}) \otimes V$, $Y = \operatorname{Hom}_K(X, \pi)$ and $Y_i = \operatorname{Hom}_K(X/X_i, \pi)$. Then $\{Y_i\}$ is a filtration of Y and $Y_i/Y_{i-1} \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Hom}_K(\nu_i \otimes V, \pi)$. By the above formula, Y_i is stable under the action of $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_{G_1}(V)$. Hence φ acts on Y_i/Y_{i-1}. Extend ν_i to a character of G such that ν_i is trivial on G_1. Then we have $\mathcal{H}_G(V) \simeq \mathcal{H}_G(\nu_i \otimes V)$ by $\varphi' \mapsto \varphi'_{\nu_i}$. We have an action of $\Phi(\varphi)_{\nu_i} \in \mathcal{H}_G(\nu_i \otimes V)$ on $\operatorname{Hom}_K(\nu_i \otimes V, \pi)$. We prove that these actions are compatible with $Y_i/Y_{i-1} \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Hom}_K(\nu_i \otimes V, \pi)$.

Since ν_i is trivial on G_1, we have $a \otimes \varphi(g^{-1})v = \Phi(\varphi)_{\nu_i}(g^{-1})(a \otimes v)$ for $g \in G_1$. The function $g \mapsto g\Psi(\psi)(\Phi(\varphi)_{\nu_i}(g^{-1})(a \otimes v))$ is right K-invariant. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{g \in G_1/K_1} g\Psi(\psi)(a \otimes \varphi(g^{-1})v) = \sum_{g \in G_1K/K} g\Psi(\psi)(\Phi(\varphi)_{\nu_i}(g^{-1})(a \otimes v))\\ = \sum_{g \in G/K} g\Psi(\psi)(\Phi(\varphi)_{\nu_i}(g^{-1})(a \otimes v)) = (\Psi(\psi) * \Phi(\varphi)_{\nu_i})(a \otimes v).\end{aligned}$$

This means that the actions are compatible.

Hence each element of $\mathcal{S}(\pi|_{G_1}, V)$ appears in $\mathcal{S}(\pi, \nu_i \otimes V)|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{G_1,*,+}]}$ for some i. Since ν_i is trivial on K_1, $(\nu_i \otimes V)|_{K_1} \simeq V|_{K_1} \simeq V_1$. We get $\mathcal{S}(\pi|_{G_1}, V) \subset \bigcup_{V'|_{K_1} = V|_{K_1}} \mathcal{S}(\pi, V')|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{G_1,*,+}]}$. ☐

3.3. **Satake parameter of tensor product.** Consider the setting in Lemma 3.2. Namely, let $\Pi = \Pi_1 \cup \Pi_2$ be a partition of Π such that $\langle \Pi_1, \check{\Pi}_2 \rangle = 0$. Let $P_i = M_iN_i$ be the standard parabolic subgroup corresponding to Π_i. Set $H_1 = Z_{M_1}([M_2, M_2])^\circ$. Put $\Pi_2^\perp = \{\lambda \in X_* \mid \langle \lambda, \Pi_2 \rangle = 0\}$. Then the group of cocharacters of $H_1 \cap T$ is $\Pi_2^\perp$. We also have $[M_1, M_1] \subset H_1 \subset M_1$. Put $X_{H_1,*,+} = X_{*,+} \cap \Pi_2^\perp$.

Lemma 3.13. *If $\lambda, \mu \in X_{*,+}$ satisfies $\mu \leq \lambda$ and $\lambda \in X_{H_1,*,+}$, then $\lambda - \mu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Pi_1$. In particular, $\mu \in X_{H_1,*,+}$.*

Proof. For each $\alpha \in \Pi$, take $n_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\lambda - \mu = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} n_\alpha \check{\alpha}$. Then for $\beta \in \Pi_2$, we have $\sum_{\alpha \in \Pi_2} n_\alpha \langle \beta, \check{\alpha} \rangle = -\langle \beta, \mu \rangle \leq 0$. Since $(\langle \beta, \check{\alpha} \rangle)_{\alpha, \beta \in \Pi_2}$ is positive definite, we have $n_\alpha = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Pi_2$. ☐

Fix an irreducible representation V of K and put $V_1 = V^{\overline{N_1(\kappa)}}$. Then V_1 is irreducible as a representation of $M_1 \cap K$. Since $[M_1, M_1] \subset H_1 \subset M_1$, V_1 is also irreducible as a representation of $H_1 \cap K$. We have $\overline{\kappa}[X_{H_1,*,+}] \hookrightarrow \overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}]$. Hence we get $\Phi' \colon \mathcal{H}_{H_1}(V_1) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_G(V)$. By the above lemma and the argument in the proof of Lemma 3.11, we get the following lemma.

Lemma 3.14. *We have* $\operatorname{Im}\Phi' = \{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_G(V) \mid \operatorname{supp}\varphi \subset KH_1K\}$ *and the isomorphism* $\operatorname{Im}\Phi' \simeq \mathcal{H}_{H_1}(V)$ *is given by* $\varphi \mapsto \varphi|_{H_1}$.

Let π be a representation of G. Consider the following homomorphism

$$\operatorname{Hom}_K(V,\pi) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{M_1\cap K}(V_1,\pi).$$

Since V is generated by V_1 as a K-representation, this is injective. The left hand side is $\mathcal{H}_G(V) \simeq \overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}]$-module and the right hand side is $\mathcal{H}_{M_1}(V_1) \simeq \overline{\kappa}[X_{M_1,*,+}]$-module where $X_{M_1,*,+} = \{\lambda \in X_* \mid \langle\lambda,\alpha\rangle \geq 0\ (\alpha \in \Pi_{M_1})\}$. Therefore, both sides are $\overline{\kappa}[X_{H_1,*,+}]$-modules. We prove that the above embedding is a $\overline{\kappa}[X_{H_1,*,+}]$-modules homomorphism. We need a lemma.

Lemma 3.15. *For* $m \in M_1$ *and* $n \in N_1$*, if* $mn \in KH_1K$*, then* $n \in K$.

Proof. By a Cartan decomposition, we can choose $\lambda \in X_{H_1,*,+}$, $\lambda_1 \in X_{M_1,*,+}$ and $k_1 \in M_1 \cap K$ such that $mn \in K\lambda(\varpi)K$ and $m \in (M_1\cap K)\lambda_1(\varpi)k_1$. Then we have $\lambda_1(\varpi)(k_1nk_1^{-1}) \in K\lambda(\varpi)K$. Put $n_1 = k_1nk_1^{-1} \in N_1$. We prove $n_1 \in K$.

By the assumption, we have $N_1 \subset M_2$. Therefore, $\lambda_1(\varpi)n_1$ is in M_2. Take $\lambda_2 \in X_{M_2,*,+}$ such that $\lambda_1(\varpi)n_1 \in (M_2\cap K)\lambda_2(\varpi)(M_2\cap K)$. Then $K\lambda_2(\varpi)K \cap K\lambda(\varpi)K \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $\lambda_2 \in W\lambda$. The Weyl group W preserves each connected component of a root system. Hence W preserves $\check{\Pi}_2^{\perp}$. Hence $\lambda_2 \in \Pi_2^{\perp}$. Therefore, $\lambda_2(\varpi)$ commutes with an element of M_2. Hence $\lambda_1(\varpi)n_1 \in (M_2\cap K)\lambda_2(\varpi)(M_2 \cap K) = \lambda_2(\varpi)(M_2\cap K)$. Therefore, $\lambda_2(\varpi)^{-1}\lambda_1(\varpi)n_1 \in K$. We get $n_1 \in K$. □

Lemma 3.16. *Let* π *be a representation of* G*. The homomorphism*

$$\operatorname{Hom}_K(V,\pi) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{M_1\cap K}(V_1,\pi).$$

is a $\overline{\kappa}[X_{H_1,*,+}]$*-module homomorphism.*

Proof. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_{H_1}(V_1)$. Take $\psi \in \operatorname{Hom}_K(V,\pi)$ and $v \in V_1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}(\psi * \Phi'(\varphi))(v) &= \sum_{g\in G/K} g\psi(\Phi'(\varphi)(g^{-1})v)\\ &= \sum_{m\in M_1/(M_1\cap K)}\ \sum_{n\in N_1/(N_1\cap K)} mn\psi(\Phi'(\varphi)(n^{-1}m^{-1})v)\end{aligned}$$

Since $\operatorname{supp}\Phi'(\varphi) \subset KH_1K$, $\Phi'(\varphi)(n^{-1}m^{-1}) = 0$ if $n \notin N_1\cap K$ by the above lemma. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\psi * \Phi'(\varphi))(v) &= \sum_{m\in M_1/(M_1\cap K)} m\psi(\Phi'(\varphi)(m^{-1})v)\\ &= \sum_{m\in M_1/(M_1\cap K)} m\psi(\Phi'(\varphi)(m^{-1})v).\end{aligned}$$

By the same argument, we have $S_G^{M_1}(\Phi'(\varphi))(m) = \Phi'(\varphi)(m)$ for $m \in M_1$. Therefore, we get the lemma. □

Let π_1, π_2 be representations of G with the central characters such that $[M_1, M_1]$ acts on π_2 trivially and the center of M_2 acts on π_2 as a scalar. Put $\pi = \pi_1 \otimes \pi_2$.

Remark 3.17. The group H_1 is generated by $H_1 \cap T$ and one-dimensional unipotent subgroup corresponding to each $\alpha \in \Delta \cap \mathbb{Z}\Pi_1$. Since $H_1 \cap T \subset Z^{\circ}_{M_2}$ and one-dimensional unipotent subgroup corresponding to $\alpha \in \Delta \cap \mathbb{Z}\Pi_1$ is a subgroup of $[M_1, M_1]$, H_1 is generated by $[M_1, M_1]$ and $Z^{\circ}_{M_2}$. Therefore, H_1 acts on π_2 by a scalar.

Proposition 3.18. *We have* $\mathcal{S}(\pi)|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{H_1,*,+}]} \subset \mathcal{S}(\pi_1|_{H_1}) \otimes \mathcal{S}(\pi_2|_{H_1})$.

Proof. We have $\mathcal{S}(\pi)|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{H_1,*,+}]} \subset \mathcal{S}(\pi|_{M_1})|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{H_1,*,+}]}$ by the above lemma. By Proposition 3.12, we have $\mathcal{S}(\pi|_{M_1})|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{H_1,*,+}]} \subset \mathcal{S}(\pi|_{H_1})$. Since H_1 acts on π_2 by a scalar, $\mathcal{S}(\pi|_{H_1}) = \mathcal{S}(\pi_1|_{H_1}) \otimes \mathcal{S}(\pi_2|_{H_1})$ by Lemma 3.5. $\square$

Lemma 3.19. *If π_1 is admissible as a representation of $[M_1, M_1]$ and π_2 is admissible as a representation of G. Then π is admissible as a representation of G.*

Proof. Let K' be a compact open subgroup. Then we have $\pi^{K'} = (\pi_1^{[M_1,M_1]\cap K'} \otimes \pi_2)^{K'}$. Since $\pi_1^{[M_1,M_1]\cap K'}$ is finite dimensional and π_2 is admissible, $\dim \pi^{K'} < \infty$. $\square$

We give some corollaries of Proposition 3.18 which we will use. We suppose the following additional assumptions.

- The representation π_1 is an admissible $[M_1, M_1]$-representation.
- The representation π_2 is an admissible G-representation.
- The derived group $[M_2, M_2]$ acts on π_1 trivially and the center of M_1 acts on π_1 as a scalar.
- We have $\#\mathcal{S}(\pi_1|_{M_1}) = \#\mathcal{S}(\pi_2|_{M_2}) = 1$.

Then there exists a unique parabolic subgroup $P = MN$ such that $\mathcal{S}(\pi_1|_{M_1}) = \{\chi_1 = (M \cap M_1, \chi_{M_1})\}$ and $\mathcal{S}(\pi_2|_{M_2}) = \{\chi_2 = (M \cap M_2, \chi_{M_2})\}$ for some χ_{M_1} and χ_{M_2}. By the above lemma, π is admissible.

Corollary 3.20. *Any $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\pi)$ is parameterized by (M, χ_M) for some χ_M.*

Proof. Take M' such that χ is parameterized by $(M', \chi_{M'})$. For each $\alpha \in \Pi$, take $\lambda_\alpha \in X_{*,+}$ such that $\langle \Pi\backslash\{\alpha\}, \lambda\rangle = 0$ and $\langle \alpha, \lambda\rangle \neq 0$. We may assume λ_α is in $\mathbb{Z}\check{\Pi}_1$ or $\mathbb{Z}\check{\Pi}_2$. Then M' corresponds to $\{\alpha \in \Pi \mid \chi(\tau_{\lambda_\alpha}) = 0\}$ [Her11, Proof of Corollary 1.5]. If $\alpha \in \Pi_1$, then $\tau_{\lambda_\alpha} \in \mathbb{Z}\check{\Pi}_1 \subset X_{H_1,*,+}$. Therefore, there exists $\chi'_1 \in \mathcal{S}(\pi_1|_{H_1})$ and $\chi'_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\pi_2|_{H_1})$ such that $\chi(\tau_{\lambda_\alpha}) = \chi'_1(\tau_{\lambda_\alpha})\chi'_2(\tau_{\lambda_\alpha})$ by Proposition 3.18. Since $\pi_2|_{H_1}$ is a direct sum of characters, $\chi_2(\tau_{\lambda_\alpha}) \neq 0$ by Proposition 3.10. Hence $\chi(\tau_{\lambda_\alpha}) = 0$ if and only if $\chi'_1(\tau_{\lambda_\alpha}) = 0$. By Proposition 3.12, $\mathcal{S}(\pi_1|_{H_1}) = \mathcal{S}(\pi_1|_{M_1})|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{H_1,*,+}]} = \{\chi_1\}|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{H_1,*,+}]}$. Therefore, we have $\chi'_1(\tau_{\lambda_\alpha}) = \chi_1(\tau_{\lambda_\alpha})$. It is zero if and only if $\alpha \in \Pi_M \cap \Pi_1$. By the same argument, for $\alpha \in \Pi_2$, $\chi(\tau_{\lambda_\alpha}) = 0$ if and only if $\alpha \in \Pi_M \cap \Pi_2$. Hence $M' = M$. $\square$

Corollary 3.21. *Assume that $M = M_1$. Then we have $\mathcal{S}(\pi) = \mathcal{S}(\pi_1) \otimes \mathcal{S}(\pi_2) = \{(M_1, \chi_{M_1}\chi_T|_{X_{M_1,*,0}})\}$.*

Proof. Take $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\pi)$ and let $\chi_M \colon X_{M,*,0} \to \overline{\kappa}^{\times}$ such that χ is parameterized by (M, χ_M). The character χ_M is given by a restriction of χ on $X_{*,+} \cap \Pi_M^{\perp} = X_{*,+} \cap \Pi_1^{\perp} = X_{H_2,*,+}$. Therefore, $\chi = \chi_1 \otimes \chi_2$. $\square$

4. A THEOREM OF CHANGING THE WEIGHT

In this section, we assume that the derived group of G is simply connected. For $\alpha \in \Pi$, we denote a fundamental weight corresponding to α by ω_α.

4.1. **Changing the weight.**

We prove the following theorem which is a generalization of Herzig's theorem [Her10, Corollarry 6.11].

Theorem 4.1. *Let V_1, V_2 be irreducible representations of K with lowest weight ν_1, ν_2, respectively. Assume that $\langle \nu_1, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0$ and $\nu_2 = \nu_1 - (q-1)\omega_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \Pi$. Let $\chi \colon \overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}] \to \overline{\kappa}$ be an algebra homomorphism parameterized by (M, χ_M). Assume that $\alpha \notin \Pi_M$. If $\check{\alpha} \notin X_{M,*,0}$ or $\chi_M(\check{\alpha}) \neq 1$, then*

$$\text{c-Ind}_K^G V_1 \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V_1)} \chi \simeq \text{c-Ind}_K^G V_2 \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V_2)} \chi.$$

Let V_1, V_2, ν_1, ν_2 be as above. Fix $\lambda \in X_{*,+}$ such that $\langle \lambda, \Pi \setminus \{\alpha\} \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle \neq 0$. Then there exist nonzero $\varphi_{21} \in \mathcal{H}_G(V_1, V_2)$ and $\varphi_{12} \in \mathcal{H}_G(V_2, V_1)$ whose support is $K\lambda(\varpi)K$. By the proof of [Her10, Corollary 6.11], Theorem 4.1 follows from the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *We have $S_G(\varphi_{12} * \varphi_{21}) \in \overline{\kappa}^\times(\tau_{2\lambda} - \tau_{2\lambda - \check{\alpha}})$.*

This lemma follows from the following two lemmas by [Her10, Proposition 5.1].

Lemma 4.3. *The composition $\varphi_{12} * \varphi_{21}$ is nonzero and its support is $K\lambda(\varpi)^2 K$.*

Lemma 4.4. *For $\mu \in X_{*,+}$, if $\mu \le 2\lambda$ then $\mu = 2\lambda$ or $\mu \le 2\lambda - \check{\alpha}$.*

First, we prove Lemma 4.3. To prove it, we use the following lemma. We use the argument in the proof of [Her10, Proposition 6.8]. For each $w \in W \simeq N_K(T(\mathcal{O}))/T(\mathcal{O})$, we fix a representative of w and denote it by the same letter w.

Lemma 4.5. *Let V, V' be irreducible representations of K with lowest weight ν, ν', $v \in V, v' \in V'$ its lowest weight vector, respectively. Assume that for $\mu \in X_{*,+}$, $V^{\overline{N_\mu}(\kappa)} \simeq (V')^{\overline{N_\mu}(\kappa)}$ as $M_\mu(\kappa)$-representations. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_G(V, V')$ be such that $\operatorname{supp}\varphi = K\mu(\varpi)K$ and $\varphi(\mu(\varpi))v = v'$. Put $\overline{I} = \operatorname{red}^{-1}(\overline{B}(\kappa))$ and $t = \mu(\varpi)$. Then we have*

$$\varphi * [1, v] = \sum_{w \in W_\nu/(W_\nu \cap W_\mu)} \sum_{a \in (w^{-1}\overline{I}w \cap \overline{N}(\mathcal{O}))/t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t} [wat^{-1}, v'].$$

Proof. We have

$$(\varphi * [1, v])(x) = \sum_{y \in G/K} \varphi(y)[1, v](xy) = \sum_{y \in KtK/K} \varphi(y)[1, v](xy).$$

If this is not zero, then $xy \in K$ for some $y \in KtK$. Hence $x \in Kt^{-1}K$. Namely, $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi * [1, v]) \subset Kt^{-1}K$. The value at $x = kt^{-1}$ for $k \in K$ is

$$(\varphi * [1, v])(kt^{-1}) = \sum_{y \in KtK/K} \varphi(y)[1, v](kt^{-1}y) = \varphi(t)[1, v](k) = \varphi(t)k^{-1}v.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\varphi * [1, v] = \sum_{k \in K/(K \cap t^{-1}Kt)} [kt^{-1}, \varphi(t)k^{-1}v].$$

Put $P = P_\mu$. We have $K \cap t^{-1}Kt \supset P(\mathcal{O})$ and $\operatorname{red}(K \cap t^{-1}Kt) = P(\kappa)$. Therefore, we have a surjective map $G(\mathcal{O})/P(\mathcal{O}) \twoheadrightarrow K/(K \cap t^{-1}Kt)$. For each

$w \in W \simeq N_K(T(\mathcal{O}))/T(\mathcal{O})$, we fix a representative of w and denote it by the same letter w. Then we have

$$G(\mathcal{O}) = \coprod_{w \in W/W_\mu} w(w^{-1}\overline{I}w \cap \overline{N}(\mathcal{O}))P(\mathcal{O}).$$

Hence $\varphi * [1, v]$ is a sum of a form $[wat^{-1}, \varphi(t)a^{-1}w^{-1}v]$ for $a \in w^{-1}\overline{I}w \cap \overline{N}(\mathcal{O})$ and $w \in W/W_\mu$. We prove that $\varphi(t)a^{-1}w^{-1}v \neq 0$ implies $w \in W_\nu W_\mu$. Since $\mathrm{red}(a) \in w^{-1}\overline{B}(\kappa)w \cap \overline{N}(\kappa) \subset w^{-1}\overline{U}(\kappa)w$, we have $a^{-1}w^{-1}v = w^{-1}v$. The homomorphism $\varphi(t)$ is given by $V \twoheadrightarrow (V)_{N_\mu(\kappa)} \simeq (V')^{\overline{N_\mu}(\kappa)} \hookrightarrow V'$. Hence if $\varphi(t)w^{-1}v \neq 0$, then $w^{-1}v \in V^{\overline{N_\mu}(\kappa)}$. Since $\{g \in G(\kappa) \mid gv \in \overline{\kappa}v\} = \overline{P_\nu}(\kappa)$, we have $\overline{P_\nu}(\kappa) \supset w\overline{N_\mu}(\kappa)w^{-1}$. Then $\Delta_\nu^+ \cup \Delta^+ \supset w(\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_\mu^+)$. Hence, $(\Delta^- \setminus \Delta_\nu^-) \cap w(\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_\mu^+) = \emptyset$. Take $w' \in W_\nu w W_\mu$ such that w' is shortest in $W_\nu w W_\mu$ [Bou02, Ch. IV, Exercises, §1 (3)]. Then $(\Delta^- \setminus \Delta_\nu^-) \cap w'(\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_\mu^+) = \emptyset$. By the condition of w', $\Delta^- \cap w'(\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_\mu^+) = \Delta^- \cap w'\Delta^+$ and $(\Delta^- \setminus \Delta_\nu^-) \cap w'\Delta^+ = \Delta^- \cap w'\Delta^+$. Therefore, we have $\Delta^- \cap w'\Delta^+ = \emptyset$. Hence $w' = 1$. We have $w \in W_\nu W_\mu/W_\mu = W_\nu/(W_\nu \cap W_\mu)$. Hence we may assume $w \in W_\nu$. Therefore, $\varphi(t)w^{-1}v = \varphi(t)v = v'$. Hence,

$$\varphi * [1, v] = \sum_{w \in W_\nu/(W_\nu \cap W_\mu)} \sum_{a \in (w^{-1}\overline{I}w \cap \overline{N}(\mathcal{O}))/(w^{-1}\overline{I}w \cap \overline{N}(\mathcal{O}) \cap t^{-1}Kt)} [wat^{-1}, v'].$$

Since $\langle \alpha, \mu \rangle < 0$ for all weight α of $\overline{N}$, $t = \mu(\pi)$ satisfies $t\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t^{-1} \supset \overline{N}(\mathcal{O})$. Hence $t\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t^{-1} \cap K = \overline{N}(\mathcal{O})$. Equivalently, we have $\overline{N}(\mathcal{O}) \cap t^{-1}Kt = t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t$. We also have $\mathrm{red}(t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t)$ is trivial. Hence $t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t \subset w^{-1}\overline{I}w$. Therefore, $w^{-1}\overline{I}w \cap \overline{N}(\mathcal{O}) \cap t^{-1}Kt = t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t$. Hence we have

$$\varphi * [1, v] = \sum_{w \in W_\nu/(W_\nu \cap W_\mu)} \sum_{a \in (w^{-1}\overline{I}w \cap \overline{N}(\mathcal{O}))/t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t} [wat^{-1}, v'].$$

□

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Put $t = \lambda(\varpi)$. Let $v_1 \in V_1, v_2 \in V_2$ be lowest weight vectors. We may assume $\varphi_{21}(t)v_1 = v_2$ and $\varphi_{12}(t)v_2 = v_1$. By Lemma 4.5, we have

$$\varphi_{21} * [1, v_1] = \sum_{w \in W_{\nu_1}/(W_{\nu_1} \cap W_\lambda)} \sum_{a \in (w^{-1}\overline{I}w \cap \overline{N}(\mathcal{O}))/t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t} [wat^{-1}, v_2].$$

By the assumption, $W_{\nu_2} \cap W_\lambda = W_{\nu_2}$. Hence we have

$$\varphi_{12} * [1, v_2] = \sum_{b \in \overline{N}(\mathcal{O})/t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t} [bt^{-1}, v_1]$$

by Lemma 4.5. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi_{12} * \varphi_{21} * [1, v_1] \\
&= \varphi_{12} * \left(\sum_{w \in W_{\nu_1}/(W_\lambda \cap W_{\nu_1})} \sum_{a \in (w^{-1}\overline{I}w \cap \overline{N}(\mathcal{O}))/t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t} [wat^{-1}, v_2] \right) \\
&= \sum_{w \in W_{\nu_1}/(W_\lambda \cap W_{\nu_1})} \sum_{a \in (w^{-1}\overline{I}w \cap \overline{N}(\mathcal{O}))/t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t} wat^{-1}\varphi_{12} * [1, v_2] \\
&= \sum_{w \in W_{\nu_1}/(W_\lambda \cap W_{\nu_1})} \sum_{a \in (w^{-1}\overline{I}w \cap \overline{N}(\mathcal{O}))/t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t} \sum_{b \in \overline{N}(\mathcal{O})/t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t} [wat^{-1}bt^{-1}, v_1] \\
&= \sum_{w \in W_{\nu_1}/(W_\lambda \cap W_{\nu_1})} \sum_{a \in (w^{-1}\overline{I}w \cap \overline{N}(\mathcal{O}))/t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t} \sum_{b \in t^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t/t^{-2}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t^2} [wabt^{-2}, v_1] \\
&= \sum_{w \in W_{\nu_1}/(W_\lambda \cap W_{\nu_1})} \sum_{c \in (w^{-1}\overline{I}w \cap \overline{N}(\mathcal{O}))/t^{-2}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t^2} [wct^{-2}, v_1].
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_G(V_1)$ whose support is $K\lambda(\varpi)^2K$ and $\varphi(\lambda(\varpi)^2)v_1 = v_1$. By Lemma 4.5, the right hand side of the above equation is $\varphi * [1, v_1]$. (Notice that $W_\lambda = W_{2\lambda}$.) Since $[1, v_1]$ generates $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V_1)$, we get the lemma. □

Finally, we prove Lemma 4.4.

Proof of Lemma 4.4. Assume that $\mu \le 2\lambda$ and $\mu \not\le 2\lambda - \check{\alpha}$. Since $\mu \le 2\lambda$, there exists $n_\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ such that $2\lambda - \mu = \sum_{\beta \in \Pi} n_\beta \check{\beta}$. Then for $\gamma \in \Pi \setminus \{\alpha\}$, we have $\sum_\beta n_\beta \langle \gamma, \check{\beta} \rangle = \langle \gamma, 2\lambda - \mu \rangle = -\langle \gamma, \mu \rangle \le 0$. By the assumption, $n_\alpha = 0$. Then $\sum_{\beta \ne \alpha} n_\beta \langle \gamma, \check{\beta} \rangle \le 0$. Since the matrix $(\langle \gamma, \check{\beta} \rangle)_{\gamma, \beta \ne \alpha}$ is positive definite, we have $n_\beta = 0$ for all $\beta \in \Pi \setminus \{\alpha\}$. Hence $\mu = 2\lambda$. □

4.2. **Comparison of composition factors.**

Herzig proved the following proposition when $G = \mathrm{GL}_n$ [Her10, Proposition 9.1]. Let $\mathrm{Ord}_{\overline{P}}(\pi)$ be the ordinary part of π defined by Emerton [Eme10].

Proposition 4.6. *Let π be an admissible representation of G which contains the trivial K-representation. Assume that there exists $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\pi, \mathbf{1}_K)$ which is parameterized by $(T, \mathbf{1}_{X_{T,*,0}} = \mathbf{1}_{X_*})$. Then π contains the trivial representation or $\mathrm{Ord}_{\overline{P}}(\pi) \ne 0$ for some proper parabolic subgroup P.*

We generalize this proposition for any G. He proved this proposition by a calculation in the affine Hecke algebra. Here, we prove the proposition in a different way. We prove the proposition from the following proposition. (In fact, we will use only the following proposition.) When $G = \mathrm{GL}_2$, this proposition is proved by Barthel-Livné [BL95, Theorem 20].

Proposition 4.7. *Let $\chi \colon \overline{\kappa}[X_*] \to \overline{\kappa}$ be an algebra homomorphism and V an irreducible representation of K. Then $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \chi$ has a finite length and its composition factors depend only on χ and the $T(\kappa)$-representation $V^{\overline{U}(\kappa)}$.*

For a parabolic subgroup $P \subset G$, let Sp_P be the special representation [GK]. We have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.8. *Let V be an irreducible K-representation such that $V^{\overline{U}(\kappa)}$ is trivial and $\chi\colon \overline{\kappa}[X_*] \to \overline{\kappa}$ an algebra homomorphism parameterized by $(T, \mathbf{1}_{X_*})$. Then the composition factors of* $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \chi$ *are* $\{\mathrm{Sp}_P \mid P \subset G\}$.

Proof. Let V_1 be the irreducible K-representation with lowest weight $-\sum_{\alpha\in\Pi}(q-1)\omega_\alpha$. Then we have $V^{\overline{U}(\kappa)} \simeq V_1^{\overline{U}(\kappa)} \simeq \mathbf{1}_{T(\kappa)}$. By Proposition 4.7, we have that $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \chi$ and $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V_1) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V_1)} \chi$ have the same composition factors. By Herzig's theorem [Her10, Theorem 3.1], we have

$$\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V_1) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V_1)} \chi \simeq \mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\text{c-Ind}_{T\cap K}^T(\mathbf{1}_{T\cap K}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_T(\mathbf{1}_{T\cap K})} \chi) = \mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\mathbf{1}_T).$$

Hence the corollary follows from [Her10, Corollary 7.3]. □

Using this corollary, we can prove Proposition 4.6.

Proof of Proposition 4.6. Let $\chi\colon \overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}] \to \overline{\kappa}$ be an algebra homomorphism parameterized by $(T, \mathbf{1}_{X_*})$. Then from the assumption, we have a nonzero homomorphism $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(\mathbf{1}_K) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(\mathbf{1}_K)} \chi \to \pi$. Hence π contains an irreducible subquotient of $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(\mathbf{1}_K) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(\mathbf{1}_K)} \chi$ as a subrepresentation. By Corollary 4.8, such subquotient is Sp_P for a parabolic subgroup P. If $P = G$, then $\mathbf{1}_G = \mathrm{Sp}_G \subset \pi$. If $P \ne G$, then $0 \ne \mathrm{Ord}_{\overline{P}}(\mathrm{Sp}_P) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Ord}_{\overline{P}}(\pi)$. □

Remark 4.9. If π is irreducible, then $\pi \simeq \mathrm{Sp}_P$. Since π contains the trivial K-representation, π is trivial by [Her10, Proposition 7.4].

In the rest of this section, we prove Proposition 4.7. We use the following theorem due to Herzig [Her10, Theorem 3.1].

Theorem 4.10. *Let V be an irreducible representation of K with lowest weight ν, $P = MN$ a standard parabolic subgroup. Assume that* $\mathrm{Stab}_W(\nu) \subset W_M$. *Then we have*

$$\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \mathcal{H}_M(V^{\overline{N}}(\kappa)) \simeq \mathrm{Ind}_P^G(\text{c-Ind}_{M\cap K}^M V^{\overline{N}(\kappa)})$$

as G-representations and $\mathcal{H}_M(V^{\overline{N}(\kappa)})$-modules.

Remark 4.11. In fact, the theorem of Herzig is weaker than this theorem. However, his proof can be applicable for this theorem.

For a parabolic subgroup $P = MN$, let V_P be the irreducible representation of K with lowest weight $-\sum_{\alpha\in\Pi\setminus\Pi_M}(q-1)\omega_\alpha$. Put $\pi_P = \mathrm{Ind}_K^G(V_P) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V_P)} \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$. Then we have $\pi_P \simeq \mathrm{Ind}_P^G(\text{c-Ind}_{M\cap K}^M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_M(\mathbf{1}_{M(\kappa)})} \overline{\kappa}[X_*])$ by Theorem 4.10. (Notice that $(V_P)^{\overline{N}(\kappa)}$ is the trivial representation.) In particular, we have $\pi_B \simeq \mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\overline{\kappa}[X_*])$. Here, T acts on $\overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ by $T \to T/T(\mathcal{O}) \simeq X_* \to \mathrm{End}(\overline{\kappa}[X_*])$. (The last map is given by the multiplication.)

Lemma 4.12. *For parabolic subgroups $P \subset P'$, there exist $\Phi_{P,P'}\colon \pi_{P'} \to \pi_P$ and $\Phi_{P',P}\colon \pi_P \to \pi_{P'}$ which have the following properties.*

1. *$\Phi_{P,P'}$ and $\Phi_{P',P}$ are G- and $\overline{\kappa}[X_*]$-equivariant.*
2. $\Phi_{P,P} = \mathrm{id}$.
3. *For $P_1 \subset P_2 \subset P_3$, $\Phi_{P_1,P_2} \circ \Phi_{P_2,P_3} = \Phi_{P_1,P_3}$ and $\Phi_{P_3,P_2} \circ \Phi_{P_2,P_1} = \Phi_{P_3,P_1}$.*
4. *For $P \subset P'$, compositions $\Phi_{P,P'} \circ \Phi_{P',P}$ and $\Phi_{P',P} \circ \Phi_{P,P'}$ are given by $\prod_{\alpha\in\Pi_{P'}\setminus\Pi_P}(\tau_{\check{\alpha}} - 1)$.*

Proof. For each $\alpha\in\Pi$, fix $\lambda_\alpha\in X_{*,+}$ such that $\langle\lambda_\alpha,\Pi\setminus\{\alpha\}\rangle=0$ and $\langle\lambda_\alpha,\alpha\rangle\neq 0$. We also fix a lowest weight vector v_P of V_P.

Let $P_1\subset P_2$ be parabolic subgroups such that $\#\Pi_{P_2}=\#\Pi_{P_1}+1$ and $\Pi_{P_2}=\Pi_{P_1}\cup\{\alpha\}$. Take $\varphi_{P_2,P_1}\in\mathcal{H}_G(V_{P_1},V_{P_2})$ and $\varphi_{P_1,P_2}\in\mathcal{H}_G(V_{P_2},V_{P_1})$ such that their support is $K\lambda_\alpha(\varpi)K$ and their value at $\lambda_\alpha(\varpi)$ send the lowest weight vector to the lowest weight vector (as in subsection 4.1). The elements φ_{P_2,P_1} and φ_{P_1,P_2} give homomorphisms $\pi_{P_1}\to\pi_{P_2}$ and $\pi_{P_2}\to\pi_{P_1}$. Let Φ_{P_1,P_2} (resp. Φ_{P_2,P_1}) be a homomorphism given by φ_{P_1,P_2} (resp. $-\tau_{\breve{\alpha}-2\lambda_\alpha}\varphi_{P_2,P_1}$). By Lemma 4.2, these homomorphisms satisfy the condition (4). For general $P'\subset P$, take a chain of parabolic subgroups $P'=P_1\subset\cdots\subset P_r=P$ such that $\#\Pi_{P_{i+1}}=\#\Pi_{P_i}+1$. Define $\Phi_{P',P}=\Phi_{P_1,P_2}\circ\cdots\circ\Phi_{P_{r-1},P_r}$ and $\Phi_{P,P'}=\Phi_{P_r,P_{r-1}}\circ\cdots\circ\Phi_{P_2,P_1}$. The by [Her10, Proposition 6.3], the condition (4) are satisfied.

It is sufficient to prove that $\Phi_{P',P}$ and $\Phi_{P,P'}$ are independent of the choice of a chain. To prove this, we may assume that the length of the chain is 2. So let P,P',P_1,P_2 be parabolic subgroups and $\alpha,\beta\in\Pi$ such that $\alpha\neq\beta$, $\alpha,\beta\notin\Pi_P$, $\Pi_{P_1}=\Pi_P\cup\{\alpha\}$, $\Pi_{P_2}=\Pi_P\cup\{\beta\}$ and $\Pi_{P'}=\Pi_P\cup\{\alpha,\beta\}$. Put $t_\alpha=\lambda_\alpha(\varpi)$ and $t_\beta=\lambda_\beta(\varpi)$. Then by Lemma 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\Phi_{P',P_1}\circ\Phi_{P_1,P})([1,v_P]) &= \sum_{a\in\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})/t_\alpha^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t_\alpha}\Phi_{P',P_1}([at_\alpha^{-1},v_{P_1}])\\ &=\sum_{a\in\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})/t_\alpha^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t_\alpha}\ \sum_{b\in\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})/t_\beta^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})t_\beta}[at_\alpha^{-1}bt_\beta^{-1},v_{P'}]\\ &=\sum_{c\in\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})/(t_\alpha t_\beta)^{-1}\overline{N}(\mathcal{O})(t_\alpha t_\beta)}[c(t_\alpha t_\beta)^{-1},v_{P'}].\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $(\Phi_{P',P_1}\circ\Phi_{P_1,P})([1,v_P])=(\Phi_{P',P_2}\circ\Phi_{P_2,P})([1,v_P])$. Therefore, $\Phi_{P',P_1}\circ\Phi_{P_1,P}=\Phi_{P',P_2}\circ\Phi_{P_2,P}$.

Since $\Phi_{P',P_1}\circ\Phi_{P_1,P}$ satisfies the condition (4),

$$(\tau_{\breve{\alpha}}-1)(\tau_{\breve{\beta}}-1)(\Phi_{P,P_2}\circ\Phi_{P_2,P'})=(\Phi_{P,P_2}\circ\Phi_{P_2,P'})\circ(\Phi_{P',P_1}\circ\Phi_{P_1,P}\circ\Phi_{P,P_1}\circ\Phi_{P_1,P'}).$$

By $\Phi_{P',P_1}\circ\Phi_{P_1,P}=\Phi_{P',P_2}\circ\Phi_{P_2,P}$, the right hand side is equal to

$$(\Phi_{P,P_2}\circ\Phi_{P_2,P'}\circ\Phi_{P',P_2}\circ\Phi_{P_2,P})\circ(\Phi_{P,P_1}\circ\Phi_{P_1,P'}).$$

Using the condition (4) for $\Phi_{P,P_2}\circ\Phi_{P_2,P'}$, this is equal to

$$(\tau_{\breve{\alpha}}-1)(\tau_{\breve{\beta}}-1)(\Phi_{P,P_1}\circ\Phi_{P_1,P'}).$$

Since π_P is a torsion-free $\overline{\kappa}[X_*]$-module [Her10, Corollary 6.5], we have $\Phi_{P,P_2}\circ\Phi_{P_2,P'}=\Phi_{P,P_1}\circ\Phi_{P_1,P'}$. We get the lemma. $\square$

We fix such homomorphisms. Since π_P is a torsion-free $\overline{\kappa}[X_*]$-module [Her10, Corollary 6.5], the condition (4) implies $\Phi_{P,P'}$ and $\Phi_{P',P}$ are injective.

Lemma 4.13. *We have* $\pi_P^K\simeq\overline{\kappa}[X_*]$.

Proof. We have $\pi_P\simeq\operatorname{Ind}_{P\cap K}^K(\text{c-Ind}_{M\cap K}^M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K})\otimes_{\mathcal{H}_M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K})}\overline{\kappa}[X_*])$ by the Iwasawa decomposition $G=KP$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_P^K&=\operatorname{Hom}_K(\mathbf{1}_K,\operatorname{Ind}_{P\cap K}^K(\text{c-Ind}_{M\cap K}^M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K})\otimes_{\mathcal{H}_M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K})}\overline{\kappa}[X_*]))\\ &\simeq\operatorname{Hom}_{M\cap K}(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K},\text{c-Ind}_{M\cap K}^M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K})\otimes_{\mathcal{H}_M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K})}\overline{\kappa}[X_*])\\ &\simeq\operatorname{End}_M(\text{c-Ind}_{M\cap K}^M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K}))\otimes_{\mathcal{H}_M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K})}\overline{\kappa}[X_*]\simeq\overline{\kappa}[X_*].\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 4.14. A homomorphism $\mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\overline{\kappa}[X_*]) \ni f \mapsto f(1) \in \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ gives an isomorphism $\pi_B^K \simeq \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$.

Set $f_0 = [1,1] \otimes 1 \in \text{c-Ind}_K^G(\mathbf{1}_K) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(\mathbf{1}_K)} \overline{\kappa}[X_*] = \pi_G$. Then π_G^K is generated by f_0 as a $\overline{\kappa}[X_*]$-module. We also have that π_G is generated by $\pi_G^K = \overline{\kappa}[X_*]f_0$ as a G-module.

Lemma 4.15. *Let $P = MN$ be a parabolic subgroup and σ_1, σ_2 representations of M. Then we have* $\mathrm{Hom}_M(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_G(\mathrm{Ind}_P^G(\sigma_1), \mathrm{Ind}_P^G(\sigma_2))$.

Proof. If $P = B$, this lemma is proved by Vignéras [Vig08, Corollaire 7]. The same proof can be applicable. □

Lemma 4.16. *The element $\tau_{\check{\alpha}} - 1 \in \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ is irreducible.*

Proof. Take $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\lambda \in X_*$ such that $\langle \alpha, X_* \rangle = d\mathbb{Z}$ and $\langle \alpha, \lambda \rangle = d$. Then we have $X_* = \mathbb{Z}\lambda \oplus \mathrm{Ker}\,\alpha$. Let $a, b \in \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ such that $\tau_{\check{\alpha}} - 1 = ab$. Put $t = \tau_\lambda$. Then we have $a = \sum_n a_n t^n$ and $b_n = \sum_n b_n t^n$ where $a_n, b_n \in \overline{\kappa}[\mathrm{Ker}\,\alpha]$. Put $k_a = \max\{n \mid a_n \neq 0\}$, $l_a = \min\{n \mid a_n \neq 0\}$, $k_b = \max\{n \mid b_n \neq 0\}$, $l_b = \min\{n \mid b_n \neq 0\}$. We may assume $k_a - l_a \leq k_b - l_b$. Take $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\lambda_0 \in \mathrm{Ker}\,\alpha$ such that $\check{\alpha} = c\lambda + \lambda_0$. Then $c = 1$ or 2 and we have $ab = \tau_{\check{\alpha}} - 1 = t^c\tau_{\lambda_0} - 1$. Therefore, $k_a + k_b = c$ and $a_{k_a} b_{k_b} = \tau_{\lambda_0} \in \overline{\kappa}[\mathrm{Ker}\,\alpha]^\times$. Replacing (a, b) with (au^{-1}, bu) for $u = t^{k_a - 1}a_{k_a} \in \overline{\kappa}[X_*]^\times$, we may assume $k_a = 1$ and $a_{k_a} = 1$. Hence $k_b = c - 1$. We prove $a \in \overline{\kappa}[X_*]^\times$. If $k_a = l_a$, then $a = t \in \overline{\kappa}[X_*]^\times$. Hence we may assume $k_a \neq l_a$. By $ab = \tau_{\check{\alpha}} - 1 = t^c\tau_{\lambda_0} - 1$, we have $l_a + l_b = 0$. Therefore, (c, k_a, l_a, k_b, l_b) satisfies the following conditions:

$$c = 1 \text{ or } 2,\ k_a = 1,\ k_b = c - 1,\ l_a < k_a,\ k_a - l_a \leq k_b - l_b,\ l_a + l_b = 0.$$

From $k_a = 1$, $k_b = c - 1$ and $k_a - l_a \leq k_b - l_b$, we have $1 - l_a \leq c - 1 - l_b$. Since $l_a + l_b = 0$, we have $1 - l_a \leq c - 1 + l_a$. Therefore, $l_a \geq 1 - c/2$. We also have $1 = k_a > l_a$. Hence $l_a \leq 0$. From this, $0 \geq 1 - c/2$. Hence $c = 2$. Therefore $0 \leq l_a \leq 1 - c/2 = 0$. Hence $l_a = 0$ and $l_b = -l_a = 0$. We get $(c, k_a, l_a, k_b, l_b) = (2, 1, 0, 1, 0)$.

Now we have $a = t + a_0$ and $b = b_1 t + b_0$. Since $ab = \tau_{\lambda_0} t^2 - 1$, we have

$$b_1 = \tau_{\lambda_0},\ a_0 b_1 + b_0 = 0 \text{ and } a_0 b_0 = -1.$$

By the last equation, $b_0 \in \overline{\kappa}[X_*]^\times$. Hence $b_0 \in \overline{\kappa}^\times \tau_\mu$ for some $\mu \in X_*$. We have $\tau_{\lambda_0} = b_1 = -b_0 a_0^{-1} = b_0^2$. Therefore, $\lambda_0 = 2\mu$. Hence $\check{\alpha} = 2(\lambda + \mu) \in 2X_*$. This is a contradiction since we assume that the derived group of G is simply connected. □

Lemma 4.17. *The image of f_0 under $\Phi_{B,G}$ is a basis of π_B^K.*

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that $\Phi_{B,G}(\pi_G^K) = \pi_B^K$. We prove $\Phi_{B,G}(\pi_G^K) \supset \prod_{\beta \in \Pi \setminus \{\alpha\}} (\tau_{\check{\beta}} - 1)\pi_B^K$ for all $\alpha \in \Pi$. Then for each $\alpha \in \Pi$, there exists $a_\alpha \in \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ such that $a_\alpha \Phi_{B,G}(f_0) = \prod_{\beta \in \Pi \setminus \{\alpha\}} (\tau_{\check{\beta}} - 1) f_0'$ where f_0' is a basis of π_B^K. Since $(\tau_{\check{\alpha}} - 1)$ are distinct irreducible elements and $\overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ is UFD, we have $\Phi_{B,G}(f_0) \in \overline{\kappa}[X_*]^\times f_0'$. Hence the lemma is proved.

So it is sufficient to prove $\Phi_{B,G}(\pi_G^K) \supset \prod_{\beta \in \Pi \setminus \{\alpha\}} (\tau_{\check{\beta}} - 1)\pi_B^K$ for all $\alpha \in \Pi$. Fix $\alpha \in \Pi$ and let P be the parabolic subgroup corresponding to $\{\alpha\}$. Since $\Phi_{P,G}(\pi_G^K) \supset \Phi_{P,G}(\Phi_{G,P}(\pi_P^K)) = \prod_{\beta \in \Pi \setminus \{\alpha\}} (\tau_{\check{\beta}} - 1)\pi_P^K$, it is sufficient to prove

$\Phi_{B,P}(\pi_P^K) = \pi_B^K$. By Lemma 4.15, $\Phi_{B,P}$ is given by a certain homomorphism $\Phi\colon \text{c-Ind}_{M\cap K}^M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K})} \overline{\kappa}[X_*] \to \mathrm{Ind}_{M\cap B}^M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap B})$. We also have $\Phi_{P,B}$ is induced by some $\Phi'\colon \mathrm{Ind}_{M\cap B}^M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap B}) \to \text{c-Ind}_{M\cap K}^M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_M(\mathbf{1}_{M\cap K})} \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$. We have $\Phi' \circ \Phi = (\tau_{\check{\alpha}} - 1)$ and $\Phi \circ \Phi' = (\tau_{\check{\alpha}} - 1)$. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove the lemma when the semisimple rank of G is one.

Now we assume that the semisimple rank of G is one. Let $\Pi = \{\alpha\}$. Take $a, b \in \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ such that $\Phi_{B,G}(\pi_G^K) = a\pi_B^K$, $\Phi_{G,B}(\pi_B^K) = b\pi_G^K$ and $ab = \tau_{\check{\alpha}} - 1$. Assume $\Phi_{B,G}(\pi_G^K) \neq \pi_B^K$. It is equivalent to $a \notin \overline{\kappa}[X_*]^\times$. By the above lemma, $b \in \overline{\kappa}[X_*]^\times$. Hence $\Phi_{G,B}(\pi_B^K) = \pi_G^K$. Since π_G is generated by π_G^K, $\Phi_{G,B}$ is surjective. Therefore, $\Phi_{G,B}$ is isomorphic. Let $\chi\colon \overline{\kappa}[X_*] \to \overline{\kappa}$ be a homomorphism defined by $\chi(\tau_\lambda) = 1$ for all $\lambda \in X_*$. Then we have $\pi_B \otimes_{\overline{\kappa}[X_*]} \chi = \mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\mathbf{1}_T)$. Hence we have $\mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\mathbf{1}_T) \simeq \pi_G \otimes_{\overline{\kappa}[X_*]} \chi$. Consider a homomorphism $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(\mathbf{1}_K) \to \mathbf{1}_G$ defined by $f \mapsto \sum_{g\in G/K} f(g)$. This gives a homomorphism $\pi_G \otimes_{\overline{\kappa}[X_*]} \chi \to \mathbf{1}_G$ and induced homomorphism $(\pi_G \otimes_{\overline{\kappa}[X_*]} \chi)^K \to (\mathbf{1}_G)^K = \mathbf{1}_G$ is an isomorphism. We have $\mathbf{1}_G = (\mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\mathbf{1}_T))^K \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\mathbf{1}_T) \simeq \pi_G \otimes_{\overline{\kappa}[X_*]} \chi \to \mathbf{1}_G$. The composition is isomorphic. Hence $\mathbf{1}_G$ is a direct summand of $\mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\mathbf{1}_T)$. Therefore, $\mathrm{End}_G(\mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\mathbf{1}_T))$ has a non trivial idempotent. However, by Lemma 3.16, $\mathrm{End}_G(\mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\mathbf{1}_T)) \simeq \mathrm{End}_T(\mathbf{1}_T) \simeq \overline{\kappa}$. This is a contradiction. $\square$

By this lemma, $\mathrm{Im}\,\Phi_{B,G}$ is a subrepresentation of π_B generated by π_B^K. For each $w \in W \simeq N_K(T(\mathcal{O}))/T(\mathcal{O})$, we fix a representative of w and denote it by the same letter w. For a subset $A \subset W$ of W, let $X_{G,A} \subset \pi_B = \mathrm{Ind}_B^G \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ be a B-stable subspace defined by $X_{G,A} = \{f \in \pi_B \mid \operatorname{supp} f \subset \bigcup_{w'\in A} Bw'B/B\}$. For $w \in W$, put $X_{G,>w} = X_{G,\{w'\in W \mid w' > w\}}$ and $X_{G,\geq w} = X_{G,\{w'\in W\mid w'\geq w\}}$. Set $X_A = X_{G,A}$, $X_{\geq w} = X_{G,\geq w}$ and $X_{>w} = X_{G,>w}$ for $A \subset W$, $w \in W$. Set $Y = \Phi_{B,G}(\pi_G)$, $Y_A = Y \cap X_A$, $Y_{>w} = Y \cap X_{>w}$ and $Y_{\geq w} = Y \cap X_{\geq w}$. For a parabolic subgroup $P = MN$, put $W(M) = \{w \in W \mid w(\Pi_M) \subset \Delta^+\}$. Then $W(M) \times W_M \to W$ is bijective [Bou02, Ch. IV, Exercises, §1 (3)].

Lemma 4.18. *Let $P = MN$ be a parabolic subgroup, $w, v_0 \in W(M)$ and $v_1 \in W_M$. Then $v_0v_1 \geq w$ if and only if $v_0 \geq w$.*

Proof. Put $v = v_0v_1$. Let ℓ be the length function of W. Then $\ell(v) = \ell(v_0) + \ell(v_1)$ [Bou02, Ch. IV, Exercises, §1 (3)]. Hence $v \geq v_0$. Therefore, $v_0 \geq w$ implies $v \geq w$.

We prove $v \geq w$ implies $v_0 \geq w$ by induction on $\ell(v_1)$. If $\ell(v_1) = 0$, then $v_1 = 1$. Hence there is nothing to prove. Assume that $\ell(v_1) > 0$ and take $\alpha \in \Pi_M$ such that $v_1 s_\alpha < v_1$ where $s_\alpha \in W_M$ is the reflection corresponding to α. Put $s = s_\alpha$. Then $\ell(v_0v_1s) = \ell(v_0) + \ell(v_1s) = \ell(v_0) + \ell(v_1) - 1 = \ell(v_0v_1) - 1$. Hence $vs < v$. By the definition of $W(M)$, we have $ws > w$. Hence we get $vs \geq w$ [Deo77, Theorem 1.1 (II, ii)]. Therefore, $v_0(v_1s) \geq w$. Since $\ell(v_1s) < \ell(v_1)$, we have $v_0 \geq w$ by inductive hypothesis. $\square$

Lemma 4.19. *We have $Y_{\geq w}/Y_{>w} = \prod_{\alpha\in\Pi, ws_\alpha < w}(\tau_{\check{\alpha}} - 1)(X_{\geq w}/X_{>w})$.*

Proof. Set $\Theta = \{\alpha \in \Pi \mid ws_\alpha < w\}$ and put $I = \prod_{\alpha\in\Theta}(\tau_{\check{\alpha}} - 1)\overline{\kappa}[X_*]$. First we prove $Y_{\geq w}/Y_{>w} \subset I(X_{\geq w}/X_{>w})$, namely, we prove $Y_{\geq w} \subset IX_{\geq w} + X_{>w}$. If $\Theta = \emptyset$, then there is nothing to prove. So we may assume $\Theta \neq \emptyset$. Let $P = MN$ be a parabolic subgroup corresponding to Θ. Recall that T acts on $\overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ and $\pi_B = \mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\overline{\kappa}[X_*])$. This action induces the action of T on $\overline{\kappa}[X_*]/I$. For $\alpha \in \Theta$,

$\operatorname{Im}\check{\alpha}$ acts on $\overline{\kappa}[X_*]/I$ trivially. Therefore, the action of T on $\overline{\kappa}[X_*]/I$ is extended to the action of M such that $[M,M]$ acts on it trivially by Lemma 3.2. We have $\operatorname{Ind}_P^G(\overline{\kappa}[X_*]/I) \subset \operatorname{Ind}_B^G(\overline{\kappa}[X_*]/I) = \pi_B/I\pi_B$.

Let $f \in (\pi_B/I\pi_B)^K = (\operatorname{Ind}_B^G(\overline{\kappa}[X_*]/I))^K$. We prove $f \in \operatorname{Ind}_P^G(\overline{\kappa}[X_*]/I)$, namely, $f(gp) = p^{-1}f(g)$ for $g \in G$ and $p \in P$. By the Iwasawa decomposition $G = KP$, there exist $k \in K$ and $p' \in P$ such that $g = kp'$. Since $P = MN = [M,M]TN = ([M,M] \cap K)([M,M] \cap B)TN = ([M,M] \cap K)B$, there exist $k' \in [M,M] \cap K$ and $b \in B$ such that $p'p = k'b$. Hence $f(gp) = f(kp'p) = f(kk'b) = b^{-1}f(1)$. Since $k' \in [M,M]$, we have $(k')^{-1}f(1) = f(1)$. Hence $f(gp) = (k'b)^{-1}f(1) = (p'p)^{-1}f(1)$. Applying this to $g = 1$ and $p = p'$, we have $f(p') = (p')^{-1}f(1)$. Hence $f(gp) = p^{-1}f(p') = p^{-1}f(kp') = p^{-1}f(g)$. So $f \in \operatorname{Ind}_P^G(\overline{\kappa}[X_*]/I)$. Hence the image of $\Phi_{G,B}(f_0)$ is in $\operatorname{Ind}_P^G(\overline{\kappa}[X_*]/I)$. Therefore, the image of Y is contained in $\operatorname{Ind}_P^G(\overline{\kappa}[X_*]/I)$.

For $f \in \pi_B$, let $\overline{f}$ be the image of f under the canonical projection $\pi_B \to \pi_B/I\pi_B = \operatorname{Ind}_B^G(\overline{\kappa}[X_*]/I)$. Let $f \in Y_{\geq w}$. Then $\operatorname{supp}\overline{f} \subset \bigcup_{w' \geq w} Bw'B/B$. Since $\overline{f} \in \operatorname{Ind}_P^G(\overline{\kappa}[X_*]/I)$, its support is right P-invariant. Hence if $\operatorname{supp}\overline{f} \cap BwB/B \neq \emptyset$, $\operatorname{supp}\overline{f} \cap Bww'B/B \neq \emptyset$ for all $w' \in W_M$. Hence $\operatorname{supp}\overline{f} \cap Bws_\alpha B/B \neq \emptyset$ for all $\alpha \in \Theta$. By the definition of Θ, each $\alpha \in \Theta$ satisfies $ws_\alpha < w$. This contradicts to $\operatorname{supp}\overline{f} \subset \bigcup_{w' \geq w} Bw'B/B$. So we have $\operatorname{supp}\overline{f} \subset \bigcup_{w' > w} Bw'B/B$. Hence $f \in X_{>w} + I\pi_B$.

We prove $Y_{\geq w}/Y_{>w} \supset I(X_{\geq w}/X_{>w})$. Let $P' = M'N'$ be a parabolic subgroup corresponding to $\Pi \setminus \Theta$. First we prove that $\Phi_{B,P'}(\pi_{P'}) \cap X_{\geq w} \to X_{\geq w}/X_{>w}$ is surjective. For each parabolic subgroup $P_1 = M_1N_1 \subset P'$, put $\pi_{M',P_1} = \operatorname{Ind}_{M' \cap P_1}^{M'}(\text{c-}\operatorname{Ind}_{M_1 \cap K}^{M_1} \mathbf{1}_{M_1 \cap K} \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_{M_1}(\mathbf{1}_{M_1 \cap K})} \overline{\kappa}[X_*])$. Then $\pi_{P_1} = \operatorname{Ind}_{P'}^G(\pi_{M',P_1})$. By Lemma 4.15, for each $P_1 \subset P_2 \subset P'$, Φ_{P_1,P_2} and Φ_{P_2,P_1} are induced by some $\Phi_{P_1,P_2}^{M'} \colon \pi_{M',P_2} \to \pi_{M',P_1}$ and $\Phi_{P_2,P_1}^{M'} \colon \pi_{M',P_1} \to \pi_{M',P_2}$. Such homomorphisms satisfy the conditions of Lemma 4.12. Therefore, $\Phi_{P_1,P_2}^{M'}$ induces a bijection $\pi_{M',P_2}^{M' \cap K} \simeq \pi_{M',P_1}^{M' \cap K}$ by Lemma 4.17. Put $\Phi = \Phi_{B,P'}^{M'}$. Then $\Phi_{B,P'}(\pi_{P'}) = \operatorname{Ind}_{P'}^G(\Phi(\pi_{M',P'}))$.

Let $f \in \Phi_{B,P'}(\pi_{P'})$. By the definition of $X_{\geq w}$, $f \in X_{\geq w}$ if and only if $\operatorname{supp} f \subset \bigcup_{v \geq w} BvB$. For $v \in W$, take $v_0 \in W(M')$ and $v_1 \in W_{M'}$ such that $v = v_0v_1$. Since $w \in W(M')$, $v \geq w$ if and only if $v_0 \geq w$ by the above lemma. Hence $\bigcup_{v \geq w} BvB = \bigcup_{v \geq w, v \in W(M')} BvW_{M'}B = \bigcup_{v \geq w, v \in W(M')} BvP'$. Therefore, $\Phi_{B,P'}(\pi_{P'}) \cap X_{\geq w} = \{f \in \operatorname{Ind}_{P'}^G(\Phi(\pi_{M',P'})) \mid \operatorname{supp} f \subset \bigcup_{v \geq w, v \in W(M')} BvP'/P'\}$. Let $Z_{\geq w}$ be this space. Put $Z_{>w} = \{f \in \operatorname{Ind}_{P'}^G(\Phi(\pi_{M',P'})) \mid \operatorname{supp} f \subset \bigcup_{v > w, v \in W(M')} BvP'/P'\}$. Then $\Phi_{B,P'}(\pi_{M',P'}) \cap X_{\geq w} \to X_{\geq w}/X_{>w}$ induces $Z_{\geq w}/Z_{>w} \to X_{\geq w}/X_{>w}$. By the Bruhat decomposition $G/P' = \bigcup_{v \in W(M')} BvP'/P'$, the space $Z_{\geq w}/Z_{>w}$ is isomorphic to the space of locally constant compact support $\Phi(\pi_{M',P'})$-valued functions on $BwP'/P' \simeq BwB/B$. The space $X_{\geq w}/X_{>w}$ is isomorphic to the space of locally constant compact support $\overline{\kappa}[X_*]$-valued functions on BwB/B. The homomorphism $Z_{\geq w}/Z_{>w} \to X_{\geq w}/X_{>w}$ is induced by $\Phi(\pi_{M',P'}) \hookrightarrow \pi_{M',B} \to \pi_{M',B}/X_{M',>1} \simeq \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$. By Remark 4.14, $\pi_{M',B'}^{M' \cap K} \hookrightarrow \pi_{M',B'} \to \pi_{M',P'}/X_{M',>1} \simeq \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ is isomorphic. Hence $\Phi(\pi_{M',P'}) \hookrightarrow \pi_{M',B'} \to \pi_{M',P'}/X_{M',>1} \simeq \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ is surjective by Lemma 4.17. Therefore $\Phi_{B,P'}(\pi_{P'}) \cap X_{\geq w} \to X_{\geq w}/X_{>w}$ is surjective.

We get $(\Phi_{B,P'}(\pi_{P'}) \cap X_{\geq w}) + X_{>w} = X_{\geq w}$. Since $I\Phi_{B,P'}(\pi_{P'}) = \Phi_{B,P'}(I\pi_{P'}) = \Phi_{B,P'}(\Phi_{P',G}(\Phi_{G,P'}(\pi_{P'}))) = \Phi_{B,G}(\Phi_{G,P'}(\pi_{P'})) \subset \Phi_{B,G}(\pi_G) = Y$, $IX_{\geq w} \subset Y \cap X_{\geq w} + IX_{>w} \subset Y_{\geq w} + X_{>w}$. We get the lemma. □

From this lemma, we get the following proposition.

Proposition 4.20. *Let V be an irreducible representation of K. The module* $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ *is free as a* $\overline{\kappa}[X_*]$*-module.*

When $G = \mathrm{GL}_2$, this proposition is proved by Barthel-Livné. In fact, they proved that $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V)$ is a free $\mathcal{H}_G(V)$-module [BL94, Theorem 19].

Proof. Let ν be a lowest weight of V. By Theorem 4.10, $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \overline{\kappa}[X_*] \simeq \mathrm{Ind}_{P_\nu}^G(\text{c-Ind}_{M_\nu \cap K}^M(V^{\overline{N_\nu}(\kappa)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_{M_\nu}(V^{\overline{N_\nu}(\kappa)})} \overline{\kappa}[X_*])$. It is sufficient to prove $\text{c-Ind}_{M_\nu \cap K}^M(V^{\overline{N_\nu}(\kappa)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_{M_\nu}(V^{\overline{N_\nu}(\kappa)})} \overline{\kappa}[X_*]$ is free. Hence we may assume $P_\nu = G$. Therefore, V is a character of K. By Corollary 3.4, there exists a character ν_G of G such that $\nu_G|_K \simeq V$. Then $\varphi \mapsto \varphi_{\nu_G^{-1}}$ gives an isomorphism $\mathcal{H}_G(V) \simeq \mathcal{H}_G(\mathbf{1}_K)$ (see 3.1). By this isomorphism, we can identify $\mathcal{H}_G(V)$ and $\mathcal{H}_G(\mathbf{1}_K)$. Under this identification, we have $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes \nu_G^{-1} \simeq \text{c-Ind}_K^G(\mathbf{1}_K)$. Hence we may assume $V = \mathbf{1}_K$. Therefore, $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \overline{\kappa}[X_*] = \pi_G \simeq Y$. Since $X_{\ge w}/X_{>w}$ is free [Vig08, Lemma 3], $Y_{\ge w}/Y_{>w}$ is free by Lemma 4.19. Hence Y is free. ☐

Proof of Proposition 4.7. We prove the proposition by induction on $\#\Pi_\nu$. Namely, we prove the following by induction on n: If ν satisfies $\#\Pi_\nu \le n$ then the module $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \chi$ has a finite length and its composition factors depend only on χ and the $T(\kappa)$-representation $V^{\overline{U}(\kappa)}$.

If $\Pi_\nu = \emptyset$, then $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \chi$ is isomorphic to a principal series representation [Her10, Theorem 3.1]. Hence the proposition follows.

Assume $\Pi_\nu \ne \emptyset$ and take $\alpha \in \Pi_\nu$. Put $\nu' = \nu - (q-1)\omega_\alpha$ and let V' be the irreducible K-representation with lowest weight ν'. By inductive hypothesis, $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V') \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V')} \chi$ has a finite length. Define $\chi' \colon \overline{\kappa}[X_*] \to \overline{\kappa}[t, t^{-1}]$ by $\chi'(\tau_\lambda) = \chi(\tau_\lambda) t^{\langle \omega_\alpha, \lambda \rangle}$ for $\lambda \in X_*$. (Here, t is an indeterminant.) Then χ factors through χ'. Put $\pi = \text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \chi'$ and $\pi' = \text{c-Ind}_K^G(V') \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V')} \chi'$. These are free $\overline{\kappa}[t, t^{-1}]$-modules by Proposition 4.20. Take $\lambda \in X_*$ such that $\langle \lambda, \Pi \setminus \{\alpha\} \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle \ne 0$. Put $a = \chi(\tau_{\check{\alpha}})$. As in 4.1, λ gives $\Phi \colon \pi \to \pi'$ and $\Phi' \colon \pi' \to \pi$ such that $\Phi \circ \Phi' = (at - 1)$. Therefore, Φ' is injective and $\operatorname{Im} \Phi' \subset (at-1)\pi$. By [CG97, Lemma 2.3.4], $\pi/(t-1)\pi$ has a finite length and $\pi/(t-1)\pi$ and $\pi'/(t-1)\pi'$ have the same composition factors. ☐

5. Classification Theorem

Using results in Section 3 and Section 4, we prove the main theorem. Almost all the proof of the theorem is a copy of Herzig's proof.

5.1. Construction of representations.

We recall the definition of supersingular representations.

Definition 5.1 (Herzig [Her10, Definition 4.7])**.** Let π be an irreducible admissible representation of G.

1. The representation π is called *supersingular with respect to* (K, T, B) if each $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\pi)$ corresponds to (G, χ_G) for some $\chi_G \colon X_{G,*,0} \to \overline{\kappa}^\times$.
2. The representation π is called *supersingular* if it is supersingular with respect to all (K, T, B).

It will be proved that π is supersingular if and only if π is supersingular with respect to (K,T,B) for a fixed (K,T,B).

Now we introduce the set of parameters $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_G$. It will parameterize the isomorphism classes of irreducible admissible representations. Before to give $\mathcal{P}$, we give one notation. Let M be the Levi subgroup of a standard parabolic subgroup and σ its representation with the central character ω_σ. Then set $\Pi_\sigma = \{\alpha \in \Pi \mid \langle \Pi_M, \check{\alpha}\rangle = 0,\ \omega_\sigma \circ \check{\alpha} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{GL}_1(F)}\}$.

Let $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_G$ be the set of $\Lambda = (\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \sigma_1)$'s such that:

- Π_1 and Π_2 are subsets of Π.
- σ_1 is an irreducible admissible representation of M_{Π_1} with the central character ω_{σ_1} which is supersingular with respect to $(M_{\Pi_1} \cap K, T, M_{\Pi_1} \cap B)$.
- $\Pi_2 \subset \Pi_{\sigma_1}$.

For $\Lambda = (\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \sigma_1) \in \mathcal{P}$, we attach the representation $I(\Lambda)$ of G by the following way. Let $P_\Lambda = M_\Lambda N_\Lambda$ be the standard parabolic subgroup corresponding to $\Pi_1 \cup \Pi_{\sigma_1}$. By Lemma 3.2, there exists the unique extension of σ_1 to M_Λ such that $[M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}, M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}]$ acts on it trivially. We denote this representation by the same letter σ_1. By the definition, $\Pi_1 \cup \Pi_2$ is a subset of $\Pi_1 \cup \Pi_{\sigma_1}$. Hence this set defines a standard parabolic subgroup of M_Λ. Let $\sigma_{\Lambda,2}$ be the special representation of M_Λ with respect to this parabolic subgroup. By the definition of special representations, $[M_{\Pi_1}, M_{\Pi_1}]$ acts on $\sigma_{\Lambda,2}$ trivially and the restriction of $\sigma_{\Lambda,2}$ to $[M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}, M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}]$ is the special representation of $[M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}, M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}]$ with respect to the standard parabolic subgroup corresponding to Π_2. In particular, the restriction of $\sigma_{\Lambda,2}$ to $[M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}, M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}]$ is irreducible. Put $\sigma_\Lambda = \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_{\Lambda,2}$ and $I(\Lambda) = I_G(\Lambda) = \mathrm{Ind}_{P_\Lambda}^G(\sigma_\Lambda)$. By the following lemma, σ_Λ is irreducible. (Apply for $H = M_\Lambda$ and $H' = [M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}, M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}]$.)

Lemma 5.2. *Let H be a group, H' a normal subgroup of H and σ_2 a representation of H which is irreducible as a representation of H' and $\mathrm{End}_{H'}(\sigma_2) = \overline{\kappa}$. For a representation σ of H, $\mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma)$ has a structure of a representation of H/H' defined by $(h\psi)(v) = h\psi(h^{-1}v)$ for $h \in H$, $\psi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma)$ and $v \in \sigma_2$.*

1. *The natural homomorphism $\mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma) \otimes \sigma_2 \to \sigma$ is injective.*
2. *If σ is irreducible, then $\mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma)$ is zero or irreducible.*
3. *For an irreducible representation σ_1 of H/H', $\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2$ is an irreducible H-representation.*

Proof. (1) Assume that the kernel of the homomorphism is non-zero. Take a finite dimensional subspace $V \subset \mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma)$ such that $V \otimes \sigma_2 \to \sigma$ is not injective. This is a H'-homomorphism. Therefore, there exists a subspace V_1 of V such that the kernel is $V_1 \otimes \sigma_2$. This means $V_1 = 0$ in $\mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma)$. This is a contradiction.

(2) Assume that σ is irreducible and $\mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma) \neq 0$. Then by (1), we have an injective homomorphism $\mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma) \otimes \sigma_2 \hookrightarrow \sigma$. Since σ is irreducible, we have $\mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma) \otimes \sigma_2 \simeq \sigma$. Therefore, $\mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma)$ is irreducible.

(3) Let $\sigma \subset \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2$ be a nonzero subrepresentation. As a representation of H', $\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2$ is a direct sum of σ_2. Hence $\mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma) \neq 0$. Since $\mathrm{End}_{H'}(\sigma_2) = \overline{\kappa}$, we have $\mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2) \simeq \sigma_1$. This is an isomorphism between H/H'-representations. Therefore, $\mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma) \subset \sigma_1$. Since σ_1 is irreducible, we have $\mathrm{Hom}_{H'}(\sigma_2, \sigma) = \sigma_1$. Therefore, $\sigma = \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2$. □

We use the following lemma. It follows from Proposition 3.7 and Corollary 3.21.

Lemma 5.3. *We have* $\mathcal{S}(I(\Lambda)) = \{(M_{\Pi_1}, \chi_{\omega_{\sigma_1}})\}$*, here,* $\chi_{\omega_{\sigma_1}} : X_{M_{\Pi_1},*,0} \to \overline{\kappa}^\times$ *is defined by* $\chi_{\omega_{\sigma_1}}(\lambda) = \omega_{\sigma_1}(\lambda(\varpi))$.

5.2. **Irreducibility of the representation.** In this subsection, we assume that the derived group of G is simply connected. We prove the irreducibility of $I(\Lambda)$. We need a lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *Let* $\Lambda = (\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \sigma_1) \in \mathcal{P}$*,* V *an irreducible representation of* K *and* ν *its lowest weight. Assume that* $\operatorname{Hom}_K(V, I(\Lambda)) \neq 0$ *and* $\alpha \in \Pi$ *satisfies* $\langle \Pi_{M_{\Pi_1}}, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0$*. Then we have* $\omega_{\sigma_1} \circ \check{\alpha}|_{\mathcal{O}^\times} = \nu \circ \check{\alpha}$.

Proof. Set $V_1 = V^{\overline{N_\Lambda(\kappa)}}$. Then V_1 is an irreducible representation of $M_\Lambda \cap K$ with lowest weight ν. Moreover, we have $\operatorname{Hom}_{M_\Lambda \cap K}(V_1, \sigma_\Lambda) \neq 0$.

Let Q be the parabolic subgroup of M_Λ corresponding to $\Pi_1 \cup \Pi_2$. Then we have $\sigma_{\Lambda,2} = \mathrm{Sp}_{Q,M_\Lambda}$. Put $L = [M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}, M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}]$. Then $\sigma_{\Lambda,2}|_L = \mathrm{Sp}_{Q\cap L, L}$. Put $\sigma_2 = \sigma_{\Lambda,2}$ and $M_1 = M_{\Pi_1}$.

Fix $\psi \in \operatorname{Hom}_{M_\Lambda \cap K}(V_1, \sigma_\Lambda) \setminus \{0\}$ and consider V_1 as a subspace of σ_Λ. Let $v \in V_1$ be a lowest weight vector. Then we have $v \in \sigma_\Lambda^{\overline{I}_{M_\Lambda,1}}$ where $\overline{I}_{M_\Lambda,1}$ is the inverse image of $(M_\Lambda \cap \overline{U})(\kappa)$ in $M_\Lambda \cap K$. Since L acts on σ_1 trivially, we have $v \in \sigma_\Lambda^{\overline{I}_{M_\Lambda,1}} \subset \sigma_\Lambda^{\overline{I}_{M_\Lambda,1}\cap L} = \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2^{\overline{I}_{M_\Lambda,1}\cap L}$. Let $\overline{\sigma_2}$ be the special representation of $M_\Lambda(\kappa)$ with respect to the parabolic subgroup $Q(\kappa)$. Then we have $\overline{\sigma_2} \hookrightarrow \sigma_2$ and we have $\overline{\sigma_2}^{(\overline{U}\cap L)(\kappa)} = \sigma_2^{\overline{I}_{M_\Lambda,1}\cap L}$ [GK]. Since $\langle \Pi_{\sigma_1}, \check{\Theta}_1 \rangle = 0$, we have $\overline{U} \cap M_\Lambda \simeq (\overline{U} \cap L) \times (U \cap [M_1, M_1])$ as algebraic groups. By the construction, $[M_1, M_1](\kappa)$ acts on $\overline{\sigma_2}$ trivially. Hence we have $\overline{\sigma_2}^{(\overline{U}\cap L)(\kappa)} = \overline{\sigma_2}^{(\overline{U}\cap M_\Lambda)(\kappa)}$. A calculation of Große-Könne [GK] shows that $T(\kappa)$ acts on $\overline{\sigma_2}^{(\overline{U}\cap M_\Lambda)(\kappa)}$ trivially. Hence $T(\mathcal{O})$ acts on $\sigma_2^{\overline{I}_{M_\Lambda,1}\cap L}$ trivially.

Take α as in the lemma. Then $\operatorname{Im}\check{\alpha} \subset Z_{M_1}$. Hence for $t \in \mathcal{O}^\times$, $\check{\alpha}(t)$ acts on σ_1 by the scalar $\omega_{\sigma_1}(\check{\alpha}(t))$. By the above argument, $\check{\alpha}(t)$ acts on $\sigma_2^{\overline{I}_{M_\Lambda,1}\cap L}$ trivially. Hence it acts on $\sigma_\Lambda^{\overline{I}_{M_\Lambda,1}}$ by the scalar $\omega_{\sigma_1}(\check{\alpha}(t))$. On the other hand, $\check{\alpha}(t)$ acts on v by the scalar $t^{\langle \nu, \check{\alpha}\rangle} = \nu(\check{\alpha}(t))$. This gives the lemma. □

Remark 5.5. If we treat the Satake transform in a natural way (see Remark 2.1), Lemma 5.3 should be $\mathcal{S}(I(\Lambda)) = \{(M_{\Pi_1}, \omega_{\sigma_1})\}$. (We use a notation of Herzig [Her10, Proposition 4.1].) Hence the above lemma should be a consequence of Lemma 5.3

Proposition 5.6. *For* $\Lambda \in \mathcal{P}$*,* $I(\Lambda)$ *is irreducible.*

Proof. Take $\Lambda = (\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \sigma_1) \in \mathcal{P}$ and put $M_1 = M_{\Pi_1}$ and $M_2 = M_{\Pi_2}$. Let χ be an algebra homomorphism $\overline{\kappa}[X_{*,+}] \to \overline{\kappa}$ corresponding to $(M_1, \chi_{\omega_{\sigma_1}})$. Then $\mathcal{S}(I(\Lambda)) = \{\chi\}$. Let $\pi \subset I(\Lambda)$ be a subrepresentation of $I(\Lambda)$. Take an irreducible K-subrepresentation V of π. Then $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{S}(\pi, V) \subset \mathcal{S}(I(\Lambda)) = \{\chi\}$. Therefore, we have a nonzero homomorphism $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \chi \to \pi$.

Let ν be a lowest weight of V. We take V such that the set $\{\alpha \in \Pi \setminus \Pi_{M_\Lambda} \mid \langle \nu, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0\}$ is minimal. We claim that this set is empty. Assume that there exists $\alpha \in \Pi \setminus \Pi_{M_\Lambda}$ such that $\langle \check{\alpha}, \nu \rangle = 0$. Put $\nu' = \nu - (q-1)\omega_\alpha$ and let V' be the irreducible K-representation with lowest weight ν'. Since $\alpha \notin \Pi_{M_\Lambda}$, we have $\alpha \notin \Pi_{\sigma_1}$. By the definition of Π_{σ_1}, we have:

- $\langle \check{\alpha}, \Pi_{M_1} \rangle \neq 0$ or
- $\omega_{\sigma_1}(\check{\alpha}(\varpi)) \neq 1$ or $\omega_{\sigma_1} \circ \check{\alpha}|_{\mathcal{O}^\times}$ is not trivial.

The above lemma shows that if $\langle \check{\alpha}, \Pi_{M_1} \rangle = 0$ then $\omega_{\sigma_1} \circ \check{\alpha}|_{\mathcal{O}^\times}$ is trivial. Therefore we have that $\langle \check{\alpha}, \Pi_{M_1} \rangle \neq 0$ or $\chi_{\omega_{\sigma_1}}(\check{\alpha}) \neq 1$. Hence we have $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \chi \simeq \text{c-Ind}_K^G(V') \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V')} \chi$ by Theorem 4.1. Therefore, we get a nonzero homomorphism $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V') \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V')} \chi \to \pi$. Namely, V' is an irreducible K-subrepresentation of π. This contradicts to the minimality of $\{\alpha \in \Pi \setminus \Pi_{M_\Lambda} \mid \langle \check{\alpha}, \nu \rangle = 0\}$.

Therefore, we have $\langle \nu, \check{\alpha} \rangle \neq 0$ for $\alpha \in \Pi \setminus \Pi_{M_\Lambda}$. Put $V_1 = V^{\overline{N_\Lambda}(\kappa)}$. By [Her10, Theorem 3.1], $\text{c-Ind}_K^V(G) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \chi \simeq \operatorname{Ind}_{P_\Lambda}^G(\text{c-Ind}_{M_\Lambda \cap K}^{M_\Lambda}(V_1) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_{M_\Lambda}(V_1)} \chi)$. Therefore, we have a homomorphism $\operatorname{Ind}_{P_\Lambda}^G(\text{c-Ind}_{M_\Lambda \cap K}^{M_\Lambda}(V_1) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_{M_\Lambda}(V_1)} \chi) \to \pi \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Ind}_{P_\Lambda}^G \sigma_\Lambda$. By Lemma 4.15, the composition is given by a homomorphism $\text{c-Ind}_{M_\Lambda \cap K}^{M_\Lambda}(V_1) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_{M_\Lambda}(V_1)} \chi \to \sigma_\Lambda$. Since σ_Λ is irreducible, this homomorphism is surjective. Therefore, $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \chi \to \operatorname{Ind}_{P_\Lambda}^G(\sigma_\Lambda)$ is surjective. In particular, $\pi \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Ind}_{P_\Lambda}^G(\sigma_\Lambda)$ is surjective. Hence $\pi = \operatorname{Ind}_{P_\Lambda}^G(\sigma_\Lambda)$. □

5.3. **Classification theorem.** We will use the following lemma.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $P = MN$ be a parabolic subgroup, σ an irreducible admissible representation of M which is supersingular with respect to (K, T, B) and ω_σ the central character of σ. Then $\operatorname{Ind}_P^G(\sigma)$ has a filtration whose graded pieces are are $\{I(\Pi_M, \Pi_2, \sigma) \mid \Pi_2 \subset \Pi_\sigma\}$.*

Proof. Let $P' = M'N'$ be the standard parabolic subgroup corresponding to $\Pi_M \cup \Pi_\sigma$. Then by Lemma 3.2, we can extend σ to M' such that $[M_{\Pi_\sigma}, M_{\Pi_\sigma}]$ acts on it trivially. We have $\operatorname{Ind}_{P \cap M'}^{M'}(\sigma) = (\operatorname{Ind}_{P \cap M'}^{M'} \mathbf{1}_M) \otimes \sigma$. So we have $\operatorname{Ind}_P^G(\sigma) = \operatorname{Ind}_{P'}^G((\operatorname{Ind}_{P \cap M'}^{M'} \mathbf{1}_{M'}) \otimes \sigma)$. The definition of the special representations implies that $\operatorname{Ind}_{P \cap M'}^{M'} \mathbf{1}_{M'}$ has a filtration whose graded pieces are $\{\operatorname{Sp}_{Q_2, M'}\}$ where Q_2 is a parabolic subgroup of M' which contains $P \cap M'$. Hence $\operatorname{Ind}_P^G(\sigma)$ has a filtration whose graded pieces are $\{\operatorname{Ind}_{P'}^G(\operatorname{Sp}_{Q_2, M'} \otimes \sigma)\}$. Let $\Pi_2' \subset \Pi_{M'}$ be a subset corresponding to Q_2. Then we have $\operatorname{Ind}_{P'}^G(\operatorname{Sp}_{Q_2, M'} \otimes \sigma) = I(\Pi_M, \Pi_2' \setminus \Pi_M, \sigma)$. □

Remark 5.8. If the derived group of G is simply connected, then $I(\Lambda)$ is irreducible by Proposition 5.6. Hence the above lemma gives composition factors of $\operatorname{Ind}_P^G(\sigma)$. In particular, it has a finite length. The irreducibility of $I(\Lambda)$ will be proved in subsection 5.4. Hence the above lemma gives composition factors of $\operatorname{Ind}_P^G(\sigma)$ for any G.

Proposition 5.9. *Assume that the derived group of G is simply connected. The correspondence $\Lambda \mapsto I(\Lambda)$ gives a bijection between $\mathcal{P}$ and the set of isomorphism classes of irreducible admissible representations.*

Proof. First, we prove that the map is surjective by induction on $\#\Pi$. Let π be an irreducible admissible representation. Let χ be an element of $\mathcal{S}(\pi)$ and assume that it is parameterized by (M_1, χ_{M_1}). We assume that M_1 is minimal. If $M_1 = G$, then π is supersingular. Therefore, we assume that $M_1 \neq G$. Take an irreducible K-representation V such that $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\pi, V)$. Let ν be a lowest weight of V. We assume that Π_ν is minimal with respect to the condition $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\pi, V)$.

Assume that there exists $\alpha \in \Pi_\nu \setminus \Pi_{M_1}$ such that $\langle \Pi_{M_1}, \check{\alpha} \rangle \neq 0$ or $\chi_{M_1}(\check{\alpha}) \neq 1$. Set $\nu' = \nu - (q-1)\omega_\alpha$ and let V' be an irreducible K-representation with lowest weight ν'. Then $\Pi_{\nu'} = \Pi_\nu \setminus \{\alpha\} \subsetneq \Pi_\nu$. By Theorem 4.1, we have $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \chi \simeq \text{c-Ind}_K^G(V') \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V')} \chi$. Hence $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\pi, V')$. This contradicts to the minimality of Π_ν. Therefore, for all $\alpha \in \Pi_\nu \setminus \Pi_{M_1}$, $\langle \Pi_{M_1}, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0$ and $\chi_{M_1}(\check{\alpha}) = 1$. From the first condition, $\langle \Pi_\nu \setminus \Pi_{M_1}, \check{\Pi}_{M_1} \rangle = 0$.

Let $P = MN$ be a parabolic subgroup corresponding to $\Pi_\nu \cup \Pi_{M_1}$. First assume that $M \neq G$. Put $V_1 = V^{\overline{N}(\kappa)}$. Then we have $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \chi \simeq \operatorname{Ind}_P^G(\text{c-Ind}_{M\cap K}^M(V_1) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_M(V_1)} \chi)$ [Her10, Theorem 3.1]. Recall that we have a surjective homomorphism $\text{c-Ind}_K^G(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_G(V)} \chi \to \pi$. Hence there exist an irreducible admissible representation σ of M and a surjective homomorphism $\operatorname{Ind}_P^G(\sigma) \to \pi$ [Her10, Lemma 9.9]. By inductive hypothesis, $\sigma = I_M(\Lambda')$ for some $\Lambda' \in \mathcal{P}_M$. Hence there exists a parabolic subgroup $P_0 = M_0 N_0$ and an irreducible admissible representation σ_0 of M_0 which is supersingular with respect to $(M_0 \cap K, T, M_0 \cap B)$ such that σ is a subquotient of $\operatorname{Ind}_{P_0 \cap M}^M \sigma_0$ by Lemma 5.7. Hence π is a subquotient of $\operatorname{Ind}_{P_0}^G(\sigma_0)$. By Lemma 5.7, all composition factors of $\operatorname{Ind}_{P_0}^G(\sigma_0)$ are $I(\Lambda)$ for some $\Lambda \in \mathcal{P}$. Hence $\pi = I(\Lambda)$ for some $\Lambda \in \mathcal{P}$.

Therefore, we may assume that $\Pi_\nu \cup \Pi_{M_1} = \Pi$. Let $P' = M'N'$ be the standard parabolic subgroup corresponding to $\Pi \setminus \Pi_{M_1}$. Then for all $\alpha \in \Pi_{M'}$, $\langle \nu, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0$, $\langle \alpha, \check{\Pi}_{M_1} \rangle = 0$ and $\chi_{M_1}(\check{\alpha}) = 1$. Set $L' = [M', M']$. Then the group of coweights $X_{L',*}$ of $L' \cap T$ is $\mathbb{Z}\Pi_{M'}$ which is a subgroup of $X_* \cap \Pi_{M_1}^{\perp}$. Put $X_{L',*,+} = X_{*,+} \cap \mathbb{Z}\Pi_{M'}$. By Lemma 3.16 and Proposition 3.12, we have $\mathcal{S}(\pi, V)|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{L',*,+}]} \subset \mathcal{S}(\pi|_{M'}, V^{\overline{N}'(\kappa)})|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{L',*,+}]} \subset \mathcal{S}(\pi|_{L'}, V^{\overline{N}'(\kappa)}|_{L'\cap K})$. Since $\langle \nu, \check{\Pi}_{M'} \rangle = 0$, $V^{\overline{N}'(\kappa)}|_{L'\cap K}$ is trivial. Therefore, $\chi|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{L',*,+}]} \in \mathcal{S}(\pi|_{L'}, \mathbf{1}_{L'\cap K})$. Set $\chi' = \chi|_{\overline{\kappa}[X_{L',*,+}]}$. We have a non-zero homomorphism $\text{c-Ind}_{L'\cap K}^{L'} \mathbf{1}_{L'\cap K} \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_{L'}(\mathbf{1}_{L'\cap K})} \chi' \to \pi$. Since χ is parameterized by (M_1, χ_{M_1}), χ' is parameterized by $(L' \cap T, \chi_{M_1}|_{X_{L',*}})$. Since we have $\chi_{M_1}(\check{\alpha}) = 1$ for all $\alpha \in \Pi_{M'}$, we have $\chi_{M_1}|_{X_{L',*}} = \mathbf{1}_{X_{L',*}}$. Hence χ' is parameterized by $(L' \cap T, \mathbf{1}_{X_{L',*}})$. Therefore, the set of composition factors of $\text{c-Ind}_{L'\cap K}^{L'} \mathbf{1}_{L'\cap K} \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_{L'}(\mathbf{1}_{L'\cap K})} \chi'$ is $\{\operatorname{Sp}_{Q',L'} \mid Q' \subset L' \text{ is a parabolic subgroup}\}$ by Proposition 4.7. Hence there exists a parabolic subgroup $P_2 = M_2 N_2$ such that $\Pi_{M_1} \subset \Pi_{M_2}$ and $\operatorname{Sp}_{P_2 \cap L', L'} \hookrightarrow \pi$. Let σ_2 be the special representation Sp_{P_2}. Then the restriction of σ_2 to L' is $\operatorname{Sp}_{P_2 \cap L', L'}$. Put $\sigma_1 = \operatorname{Hom}_{L'}(\sigma_2, \pi)$. This is non-zero. By Lemma 5.2, σ_1 is an irreducible representation of G and $\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \xrightarrow{\sim} \pi$.

We prove σ_1 is supersingular as a representation of M_1. Since L' acts on σ_1 trivially, σ_1 is regarded as a representation of G/L'. By Lemma 3.2, $M_1 \to G/L'$ is surjective. Therefore, $\sigma_1|_{M_1}$ is irreducible. By inductive hypothesis, $\sigma_1|_{M_1} \simeq I_{M_1}(\Lambda')$. In particular, $\#\mathcal{S}(\sigma_1|_{M_1}) = 1$. Since χ is parameterized by (M_1, χ_{M_1}), an element of $\mathcal{S}(\sigma_1|_{M_1})$ is parameterized by (M_1, χ'_{M_1}) for some χ'_{M_1} by Corollary 3.20. Hence σ_1 is supersingular.

We prove that the map is injective. Let $\Lambda' = (\Pi'_1, \Pi'_2, \sigma'_1)$ and assume that $I(\Lambda) \simeq I(\Lambda')$. Then we have $\mathcal{S}(I(\Lambda), V) = \mathcal{S}(I(\Lambda'), V) \neq \emptyset$ for some irreducible representation V of K. By Lemma 5.3, $(M_{\Pi_1}, \chi_{\omega_{\sigma_1}}) = (M_{\Pi'_1}, \chi_{\omega_{\sigma'_1}})$. Hence $\Pi_1 = \Pi'_1$. Let ν be a lowest weight of V. Then by Lemma 5.4, for $\alpha \in \Pi$ such that $\langle \Pi_1, \check{\alpha} \rangle = 0$, $\omega_{\sigma_1} \circ \check{\alpha}|_{\mathcal{O}^\times} = \nu \circ \check{\alpha} = \omega_{\sigma'_1} \circ \check{\alpha}|_{\mathcal{O}^\times}$. On the other hand, we have $\omega_{\sigma_1} \circ \check{\alpha}(\varpi) = \chi_{\omega_{\sigma_1}}(\check{\alpha}) = \omega_{\sigma'_1} \circ \check{\alpha}(\varpi)$. Hence $\omega_{\sigma_1} \circ \check{\alpha} = \omega_{\sigma'_1} \circ \check{\alpha}$. Therefore, we have $\Pi_{\sigma_1} = \Pi_{\sigma'_1}$. Hence $P_\Lambda = P_{\Lambda'}$.

Now we have $\operatorname{Ind}_{P_\Lambda}^G(\sigma_\Lambda) \simeq \operatorname{Ind}_{P_\Lambda}^G(\sigma_{\Lambda'})$. By Lemma 4.15, we have a nonzero homomorphism $\sigma_\Lambda \to \sigma_{\Lambda'}$. Since σ_Λ and $\sigma_{\Lambda'}$ are irreducible, $\sigma_\Lambda \simeq \sigma_{\Lambda'}$. Set $L = [M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}, M_{\Pi_{\sigma_1}}]$. As a representation of L, σ_Λ is a direct sum of special representations $\operatorname{Sp}_{Q_2,L}$ where Q_2 is a parabolic subgroup of L corresponding to Π_2. Hence we have $\Pi_2 = \Pi_2'$. Therefore, $\sigma_{\Lambda,2} \simeq \sigma_{\Lambda',2}$. Hence we have $\sigma_1 \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_L(\sigma_{2,\Lambda}, \sigma_\Lambda) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_L(\sigma_{2,\Lambda'}, \sigma_{\Lambda'}) \simeq \sigma_1'$. We get $\Lambda = \Lambda'$. □

5.4. **General case and corollaries.**

Theorem 5.10. *Let G be a connected split reductive algebraic group. Then $I(\Lambda)$ is irreducible for all $\Lambda \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\Lambda \mapsto I(\Lambda)$ gives a bijection between $\mathcal{P}$ and the set of isomorphism classes of irreducible admissible representations.*

Proof. Take a z-extension $1 \to Z \to \widetilde{G} \to G \to 1$ of G. For each parabolic subgroup $P = MN$, let $\widetilde{M}$ be the Levi subgroup of the parabolic subgroup of $\widetilde{G}$ corresponding to Π_M. Then $1 \to Z \to \widetilde{M} \to M \to 1$ is a z-extension of M. For each representation π of G, let $\widetilde{\pi}$ be the pull-back of π to $\widetilde{G}$. Then we have $I_G(\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \sigma_1)^{\sim} = I_{\widetilde{G}}(\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \widetilde{\sigma_1})$. By Proposition 5.6, this is irreducible. Hence $I_G(\Lambda)$ is irreducible for $\Lambda \in \mathcal{P}$.

We also have that $I_G(\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \sigma_1) \simeq I_G(\Pi_1', \Pi_2', \sigma_1')$ if and only if $I_{\widetilde{G}}(\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \widetilde{\sigma_1}) \simeq I_{\widetilde{G}}(\Pi_1', \Pi_2', \widetilde{\sigma_1'})$. Hence we have $\Pi_1 = \Pi_1'$, $\Pi_2 = \Pi_2'$ and $\widetilde{\sigma_1} \simeq \widetilde{\sigma_1'}$ by Proposition 5.9. Hence we have $\sigma_1 \simeq \sigma_1'$.

Let π be an irreducible admissible representation of G. Then there exists $\Lambda_0 = (\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \sigma_{1,0}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{G}}$ such that $\widetilde{\pi} = I_{\widetilde{G}}(\Lambda)$. Since Z is contained in the center of M_{Π_1}, it acts on $\sigma_{1,0}$ by the scalar. By the construction of $I_{\widetilde{G}}(\Lambda)$, Z acts on $I_{\widetilde{G}}(\Lambda) \simeq \widetilde{\pi}$ by the same scalar. It is trivial since Z acts on $\widetilde{\pi}$ trivially. Hence Z acts on $\sigma_{1,0}$ trivially, namely, $\sigma_{1,0} \simeq \widetilde{\sigma_1}$ for some representation of G. Hence $\pi = I_G(\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \sigma_1)$. We get the theorem. □

We give corollaries of this theorem.

Corollary 5.11. *For any irreducible admissible representation π of G, $\#\mathcal{S}(\pi) = 1$.*

Proof. Obvious from Lemma 5.3 and Theorem 5.10. □

Corollary 5.12. *Let π be an irreducible admissible representation of G. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

1. *The representation π is supersingular.*
2. *The representation π is supersingular with respect to (K, T, B).*
3. *The representation π is supercuspidal.*

Proof. Take $\Lambda = (\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \sigma_1) \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\pi = I(\Lambda)$. Then by Lemma 5.3, π is supersingular with respect to (K, T, B) if and only if $\Pi_1 = \Pi$. By Lemma 5.7, π is a subquotient of $\mathrm{Ind}_{P_1}^G(\sigma_1)$. Hence, if π is not supersingular with respect to (K, T, B), then π is not supercuspidal.

Assume that π is a subquotient of $\mathrm{Ind}_{P_0}^G \sigma_0$ for a proper parabolic subgroup $P_0 = M_0N_0$ and an irreducible admissible representation σ_0. By Lemma 5.7, we may assume σ_0 is supersingular with respect to (K, T, B). By Lemma 5.7, $P_{\Pi_1} = P_0$. Hence π is not supersingular with respect to (K, T, B).

Hence (2) and (3) are equivalent. Since the property (3) is independent of a choice of (K, T, B), (2) and (1) are equivalent. □

Corollary 5.13. *Let $P = MN$ be a parabolic subgroup and σ a finite length admissible representation of M. Then $\mathrm{Ind}_P^G \sigma$ has a finite length.*

Proof. We may assume σ is irreducible. This follows from Lemma 5.7 and Remark 5.8, □

Corollary 5.14. *Let* $\nu\colon T \to \overline{\kappa}^\times$ *be a character. Then* $\operatorname{Ind}_B^G(\nu)$ *has a length* 2^C *where* $C = \#\{\alpha \in \Pi \mid \nu \circ \check{\alpha} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{GL}_1}\}$. *In particular,* $\operatorname{Ind}_B^G(\nu)$ *is irreducible if and only if* $\nu \circ \check{\alpha} \neq \mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{GL}_1}$ *for all* $\alpha \in \Pi$.

Proof. Notice that any character of T is supersingular. Hence this follows from Lemma 5.7 and Remark 5.8. □

References

[BL94] L. Barthel and R. Livné, *Irreducible modular representations of* GL_2 *of a local field*, Duke Math. J. **75** (1994), no. 2, 261–292.

[BL95] L. Barthel and R. Livné, *Modular representations of* GL_2 *of a local field: the ordinary, unramified case*, J. Number Theory **55** (1995), no. 1, 1–27.

[Bou02] Nicolas Bourbaki, *Lie groups and Lie algebras. Chapters 4–6*, Elements of Mathematics (Berlin), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002, Translated from the 1968 French original by Andrew Pressley.

[BP] Christophe Breuil and Vytautas Paškūnas, *Towards a modulo p Langlands correspondence for* GL_2, to appear in Memoirs of Amer. Math. Soc.

[Bre03] Christophe Breuil, *Sur quelques représentations modulaires et p-adiques de* $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbf{Q}_p)$. *I*, Compositio Math. **138** (2003), no. 2, 165–188.

[CG97] Neil Chriss and Victor Ginzburg, *Representation theory and complex geometry*, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1997.

[Deo77] Vinay V. Deodhar, *Some characterizations of Bruhat ordering on a Coxeter group and determination of the relative Möbius function*, Invent. Math. **39** (1977), no. 2, 187–198.

[Eme10] Matthew Emerton, *Ordinary parts of admissible representations of p-adic reductive groups I. Definition and first properties*, Astérisque (2010), no. 331, 355–402.

[GK] Elmar Große-Klönne, *On special representations of p-adic reductive groups*, preprint.

[Her10] Florian Herzig, *The classification of irreducible admissible mod p representations of a p-adic* GL_n, arXiv:1005.1713, to appear in Invent. Math.

[Her11] Florian Herzig, *A satake isomorphism in characteristic p*, Compos. Math. **147** (2011), no. 1, 263–283.

[Vig08] Marie-France Vignéras, *Série principale modulo p de groupes réductifs p-adiques*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **17** (2008), no. 6, 2090–2112.

Creative Research Institution, Hokkaido University, N21 W10, Kita-ku Sapporo 001-0021, Japan

E-mail address: `abenori@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp`